DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 747 HE 027 930

AUTHOR	Boyd, Sally; Wylie, Cathy
TITLE	Workload and Stress in New Zealand Universities.
INSTITUTION	Association of Univ. Staff of New Zealand, Wellington.; New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-908916-74-4
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	114p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Libraries; College Faculty; *Educational Change; Employee Attitudes; Faculty Workload; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Librarians; *Personnel; Questionnaires; Salaries; Sex Differences; *Stress Management; Universities; *Work Attitudes; *Work Environment; Working Hours
IDENTIFIERS	*Faculty Attitudes; *New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This study examined the workloads of academic, general, support, library, and technical staff of New Zealand universities. It focused on current levels of workload, changes in workload levels and content, connections between workload and stress, and staff attitudes towards the effects of workload changes and educational reforms on the quality of their work. A total of 1,181 Association of University Staff members were surveyed through mailed questionnaires. The findings showed increasing workloads and stress for many university staff, and suggest that the overall quality of working life is declining for many university staff. Many of those surveyed felt that their work was often or always stressful; the majority stated that their work had become more stressful recently, and that they saw this trend continuing in the future. One of the major factors involved in the increase in stress levels was increase in workload. Females and recently appointed academics were identified as more likely to experience stress compared with academics in general. Two appendixes provide demographic information about the respondents, additional data tables, and copies of the academic and administrative support personnel questionnaires. (Contains 33 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 747

BEST COPY AVAILABLF

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
New Zealand Council for Educational Research
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WORKLOAD AND STRESS IN NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES

Sally Boyd and Cathy Wylie

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
and
The Association of University Staff of New Zealand

1994

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

The Association of University Staff of New Zealand
PO Box 11-767
Wellington
New Zealand

© NZCER and AUSNZ, 1994

ISBN 0-908916-74-4

Distributed by NZCER Distribution Services
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Tables vi
Acknowledgments viii

SUMMARY 1
- All Occupational Groups 1
- Academic Staff 2
- General Staff 2
- Academic Support Staff 3
- Administrative Support Staff 3
- Library Staff 4
- Technical Staff 4

INTRODUCTION 5
- Review of Current Situation 5
- Background Literature Review 5
- Overseas Research: Workload 5
  - Workload 5
  - Staff:Student Ratios 6
  - Administration Staff and Salaries 7
  - Issues 7
- Overseas Research: Stress 7
  - All University Staff 7
  - Academic Staff 8
  - Library Staff 9
  - Teachers 9
- New Zealand Research 10
- Recommendations for Workload and Stress Management from the Research 11
- Summary 12

SAMPLE DESIGN 13
- Survey Development 13
- Questionnaire Trialling 13
- Sampling 13
- Interpretation of Tables and Statistics 13
- Analysis 14
- Response Characteristics 14
- Sample Representativeness 14

RESULTS 15
1 - WORK HOURS, WORK STATUS, AND SALARY 15
- Employment Status 15
- Average Hours Worked Per Week 16
- Work Outside University Hours 17
- Average Salary of Full-time Staff 17
- Adequacy of Salary 18

Summary 19

2 - RESPONSIBILITIES 20
- Teaching Responsibilities 20
  - Academic Staff 20
  - Academic Support Staff 20
  - Administrative Support staff 20
  - Library Staff 20
  - Technical Staff 21
- Student Numbers 21
- Workload Responsibilities 22
  - Academic Staff 22
  - Academic Support Staff 22
  - Administrative Support Staff 22
  - Library Staff 22
  - Technical Staff 22
- Summary 23

3 - CHANGES 24
- Changes to Total Workload 24
- Changes to Workload Areas 25
- Expected Changes to Workload in the Future 26
- Changes to the Number of Requests for Services 26
  - Academic Support Staff 26
  - Administrative Support Staff 26
  - Library Staff 27
  - Technical Staff 27
- Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed 27
- Changes to Work Situation 27
- Summary 28

4 - REASONS FOR CHANGES 30
- Reasons for Changes to Workload 30
- Reasons for Changes to Work Situation 31
- Balance in Workload 32
- Training 32
- Summary 33

5 - IMPACTS OF CHANGES 34
- Impact on Workloads 34
- Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed 35
- Other Impacts of Changes to Workload 35
- Impact of Changes to University Structure and Management 37
- Impact on Personal and Family Life 38
- Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses 38
- Summary 39

6 - STRESSES AND PRESSURES 40
- Current Stress Levels 40
- Recent Changes to Stress Levels 41
- Expected Changes to Stress Levels in the Future 42
- Stress Ratings 43
- Sources of Stress 45
- Stress Profile 47
  - Academic Staff 47
  - Academic Support Staff 47
  - Administrative Support Staff 47
  - Library Staff 47
  - Technical Staff 47
- Relationship Between Workload and Stress 48
- Relationship Between Gender and Stress for Academic Staff 49
- Current Job Satisfaction 50
- Recent Changes to Job Satisfaction 51
- Summary 52

7 - IMPROVEMENTS AND ISSUES 53
- Work Improvements 53
- Summary 54
- Current Issues 55
- Issues for Academic Staff 56
  - Auckland 56
  - Waikato 56
  - Massey 57
  - Victoria 57
  - Canterbury 57
  - Lincoln 57
  - Otago 57
- Equity 57
- Summary 58

8 - OVERVIEW: RESULTS AND ISSUES 59

APPENDIX A: Details of Respondents and Additional Tables 61

APPENDIX B: Academic and Administrative Support Questionnaires 75

References 103

Tables

Page

1 Type of Contract 15
2 Term of Contract 15
3 Total Length of Time in University Employment 16
4 Length of Time in Present Position 16
5 Average Hours Worked Per Week by Full-time Respondents 17
6 Average Salary of Full-time Respondents 18
7 Views of Salary Adequacy in Relation to Work 18
8 Comments on Salary Adequacy 19
9 Minimum Number of Students Taught or Assisted in Any One Course 21
10 Maximum Number of Students Taught or Assisted in Any One Course 22
11 Changes to Total Workload in Recent Years 24
12 Increases to Workload by University 24
13 Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases and Decreases in Work Areas 25
14 Expected Workload Levels in Future 26
15 Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed 27
16 Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement and Deterioration in Work Situation 28
17 Reasons for Workload Changes 30
18 Reasons for Work Situation Changes 31
19 Balance in Workload 32
20 Net Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training 33
21 Impact of Change on Number of Requests for Services 34
22 Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed 35
23 Impact of Workload Changes 36
24 Impact of Change to University Structure and Management 37
25 Respondents Experiencing Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses While in University Employment 38
26 Work-related Injuries and Stress Illnesses 39
27 Current Work Stress 40
28 Stress Levels by University 41
29 Recent Changes to Stress Levels 42
30 Recent Changes to Stress Levels by University 42
31 Expected Stress Levels in Future 43
32 Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 25% or More of Respondents 44
33 Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 10% or Less of Respondents 45
34 Stresses Mentioned by More than 10% of Respondents 46
35 Current Levels of Job Satisfaction 50
36 Recent Changes to Levels of Job Satisfaction 51
37 Likelihood of Being in University Employment in 1999 51
38 Changes That Would Make Work More Worthwhile Listed by More than 10% of Respondents 53
39 Current Issues Mentioned by More than 10% of Respondents 55
40 Sample Population 61

41 Return Rate by Occupational Group and University 61
42 Ethnicity of Respondents 62
43 Gender of Respondents 62
44 Age of Respondents 63
45 Location Within University 63
46 Representativeness by University 64
47 Representativeness by Gender 64
48 Representativeness by Academic Rank 64
49 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases in Workload Areas 65
50 Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Workload Areas 66
51 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Decreases in Workload Areas 67
52 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement in Work Situation 68
53 Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Work Situation 69
54 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Deterioration in Work Situation 70
55 Balance of Workload 71
56 Impacts of Changes to University Structure and Management: Comments Made by 10% or Less of Those Responding to the Question 72
57 Impacts of Workload Changes: Comments Made by 10% or Less of Those Responding to the Question 72
58 Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by Less than 25% of Respondents 73
59 Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training 74
60 Percentage of Respondents Not Receiving Adequate Training 74
61 Training: Other Categories (Unsure/Not Applicable) 74

Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to all those AUS members who responded to the trial and final questionnaires; the members of the steering committee: Alistair Anderson, Jenny Chapman, Christine Cheyne, Charlotte Fitzgerald, Terry Gourley, Jenny Hart, Anne Jackson, Nick Park, Varvara Richards, and Bill Rosenberg; Rob Crozier and AUS national office staff for their comments, advice, and help; the AUS National Committees for help with questionnaire trialling; Dave Clarke for information on stress research at Massey; Val Podmore for advice and feedback on the draft report; Pat Webster for coding of the questionnaires; Debe Mansfield for the cover illustration; Dave Atmore for sampling advice; Barb Bishop and Gloria Hanson for data analysis; Peter Ridder for advice on design; Fay Swann for editing; Carlene Grigg, Angela Tennant, and Anita Walford for data entry; Lia Armstrong and Sonia Tamasese for secretarial services; and Barbara McKenzie and Keith Pickens for literature searches.

SUMMARY

The findings of this survey show increasing workloads and stress for many university staff. This trend is an important issue that needs to be addressed. Other related issues that emerged from this research were:

- staffing;
- work organisation in terms of hours worked, seasonal peaks, interruptions, and balance between areas (e.g., teaching and research);
- increasing student numbers and deteriorating staff:student ratios;
- promotion criteria;
- salaries;
- university management;
- inequities experienced by general staff, staff from ethnic minorities, and women staff; and
- university funding.

All Occupational Groups

- The majority of respondents had experienced recent increases to their workload and stress levels. Those who reported increases to workload were more likely to report high levels of work stress.

- Increases to workload, student numbers, and job responsibilities were the reasons most often given by members of all occupational groups for changes to their work situation. Only a very small number (0-2% of each occupational group) had noticed no recent changes to their working situation.

- The overall level of workload, deadlines and demands, and interruptions to work were rated as the factors that caused the most work stress by the respondents from all occupational groups with the exception of library staff.

- More people in all occupational groups indicated a deterioration in the quality of university management and their working life compared to those who indicated an improvement.

- Management was one of the most frequently mentioned university issues for all occupational groups. Other issues frequently mentioned included: student funding, general university funding, university staff salaries, and the impact of government policies on education.

- Employing more support staff, improving university management, and salary increases were commonly mentioned suggestions for improvement of the university environment.

- Staffing levels and the lack of support staff and relief staff time were also issues for large numbers of respondents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Academic Staff

- 80% of academics said that their workload had increased in recent years and 47% expected their workload to increase in future.
- The estimated average working week for full-time academics was 53 hours. The estimated average time spent on each key work area was 48% on teaching, 23% on research, 21% on administration, and 8% on other areas.
- The work area in which the largest number of academics reported increases was course and lecture planning. Large numbers also reported increases to the amount of time they spent dealing with student inquiries and internal administration. Academics were the only group who reported decreases in some workload areas: research, writing and publishing, and professional development. The decline in the amount of time spent on these areas was causing some concern about teaching and research standards.
- Respondents to this survey are working similar hours to their counterparts in the United States, and experiencing similar stress increases to their counterparts in the United Kingdom. The opposite to the U.S. trend towards more focus on research appears to be occurring in New Zealand.
- 48% of academics often or almost always found their work stressful and 80% said that their work had become more stressful in recent years, compared to 68% of general staff. Academic women were more stressed than their male counterparts.
- Academic staff mentioned problems with staff relationships and conflicts more often than other groups, and were the only group in which more than a quarter of respondents rated internal administration as stressful.
- Academics were more likely than members of the other university occupational groups to say that the quality of their working life and their level of job satisfaction had deteriorated.
- As well as the overall university issues previously mentioned, large numbers of academics were also concerned about current and future changes to the university system (e.g., semesterisation).

General Staff

- Salary was an important issue for the 3 lowest paid general staff groups. General staff, particularly those at the lower end of salary scales, were more likely to say that their salary did not reflect their work.
- General staff males were more likely to be stressed than general staff females.
- Lack of promotion and career prospects were rated as often or always stressful by at least 28% of each general staff group.
- Lack of recognition for, and feedback about, work was often or always a source of stress for more than a quarter of administrative support, technical, and library staff.
- A fifth of administrative support, technical, and library staff were concerned about the lack of settlement of their employment contracts.

- Equity with academic staff and poor treatment of general staff were a concern for 12-19% of each general staff group.

Academic Support Staff

- 85% of academic support staff said that their workload had increased recently and 78% expected their workload to increase in future.

- The estimated average working week for full-time academic support staff was 44 hours. The estimated average time spent on each key work area was 43% on providing professional services, planning, and liaison for students, staff, and other clients, 35% on providing technical or computer services, 14% on administration, and 9% on other areas.

- The work area in which the largest number of academic support staff reported increases was support and services to staff.

- 44% of academic support staff often or almost always found their work stressful and 67% said that their work had become more stressful in recent years.

- Academic support staff were less likely to find their on-the-job training adequate than respondents from other groups.

Administrative Support Staff

- 78% of administrative support staff said that their workload had increased recently and 66% thought that their workload was likely to increase in future.

- The estimated average working week for full-time administrative support staff was 41 hours. The estimated average time spent on each key work area was 34% providing support or information to students, staff, and other clients, 26% on word-processing, photocopying, etc., 19% on administration, and 21% on other areas.

- The work areas in which the largest numbers reported increases were providing support and services to staff, and internal administration.

- 37% of administrative staff often or almost always found their work stressful, and 69% said that their work had become more stressful in recent years.

- Administrative support staff rated the clarity of their job roles, and office and work space, as stressful more often than members of the other occupational groups.

- Administrative support staff were the lowest paid group, the most dissatisfied, the most likely to think that their salary did not reflect their work, and the most likely to want a salary increase.

- Staff morale was a major issue for administrative support staff (as well as the issues previously mentioned).

Library Staff

- Librarians were more content with their work than other groups, they worked fewer hours on average, and reported less workload increases, more job satisfaction, less stress and less deterioration in the quality of their working life over all.
- The estimated average working week for full-time library staff was 39 hours. The estimated average time spent on each key work area was 45% on general non-contact duties, 33% on customer service, 13% on administration, and 8% on other areas.
- 76% of library staff said that their workload had increased in recent years and 62% thought that it was likely to increase in future.
- The work areas in which the largest numbers of librarians reported increases were providing support and services to students, and non-contact library duties.
- 26% of library staff often or almost always found their work stressful and 65% said that their work had become more stressful in recent years.
- Library staff rated lack of relief staff time, the overall level of their workload, and staffing levels as the 3 factors that caused them the most stress.
- Many librarians would like more challenge in their work.

Technical Staff

- 85% of technical staff said that their workload had increased recently, and 56% thought it was likely to increase in future.
- The estimated average working week for full-time technical staff was 40 hours. The estimated average time spent on each key work area was 28% providing technical support for teaching, 30% providing technical support for research, 21% on general technical services, 14% on administration, and 8% on other areas.
- 32% of technical staff often or almost always found their work stressful, and 69% said that their work had become more stressful in recent years.
- The work area in which the largest numbers of technicians reported increases was internal administration.
- The technical occupational group contained the largest numbers of respondents who thought that they were not adequately trained for new technology and equipment. Technicians also tended to mention problems with equipment and computers more often than other respondents.
- Technicians were the only group who reported an overall deterioration of their work environment in terms of office and work space.

INTRODUCTION

Review of Current Situation

Since 1987 the climate within which New Zealand universities operate has changed substantially, primarily due to changes to funding policy and legislation that have directly affected universities. The main changes to funding policy have been the introduction and subsequent reduction of Equivalent Full-time Student funding (EFTS) and changes to research funding. Legislative changes include the Education Act (1989), the Public Finance Act (1989) that required universities to be more accountable to the government, the Employment Contracts Act (1991), the Health and Safety in Employment Act (1992), Fire Safety and Evacuation of Buildings Regulations (1992), and the Privacy Act (1993).

These legislative and policy changes have led to alterations in the university system, for example, the devolution of financial administration and budgeting from the central university administrative system to individual departments. Economic changes have also had an impact, with rapidly increasing numbers of students attending tertiary institutions and increasing student hardship as student tuition fees rise and the average level of student allowances fall.

The AUS Council commissioned this study to discover what effect these changes were having after being presented with increasing anecdotal evidence that workloads and stress levels were rising for staff working in New Zealand universities.

The objectives of this study are to provide information on, and insights into:

- Current levels of workload, hours of work, and responsibilities of university staff;
- Changes in university staffs' workload levels and content, levels, and amounts of responsibility, and working relations;
- Any connection between workload and stress levels; and
- Whether university staff believe workload changes and educational reforms have affected the quality of their work.

Background Literature Review

Most of the current research and writing on workload and stress issues in New Zealand and international university settings concentrates on documenting the experiences of academic staff. There is a dearth of literature on the experiences of members of other occupational groups. This disparity is reflected in this overview.

Overseas Research: Workload

Workload

In the United States similar changing educational trends affecting the quality and availability of access to education are occurring. Pratt, cited in Mingle (1992) concluded that:

> we are on a collision course with demography, in the states, across the nation and around the world (p. 1, Mingle 1992).

In his review of studies on faculty (academic) workload, Mingle (1992) advanced 3 interconnected components of this "collision course": cost, quality, and access. He concluded that the growth in demand for tertiary education and increased student numbers would affect the quality of teaching and educational standards. Mingle cited a 1989 national survey in the United States that reported the average workload per week for faculty to be 53 hours. The average number of hours worked per week had increased over the last 4 decades. He noted a shift in workload emphasis from teaching to research, due to the growth in availability of research dollars, and the increasing competitiveness of tenured positions.

Bleything (1982) identified 6 major areas of faculty workload: direct contact teaching, preparation and evaluation, research, public service, administration, and professional development. In summarising various studies of faculty workload he found that faculty members spent an average of 46% to 74% of their time on teaching activities.

Allen (1994) discussed changes in workload in the context of "commercialisation" of education and inadequate funding. He noted a trend for faculty to be hired at entry-level, and duties previously undertaken by faculty to be devolved to teaching assistants. He reported that on average most U.S. studies found faculty workload to be 46 hours per week in 1978, compared with 53 hours per week in 1987. Allen summarised data to show that the average U.S. faculty member spent 56% of their time on teaching activities, 16% on research, and 13% on administration. When considering future trends Allen concluded:

> A generation ago faculty members resolved the conflict between teaching and research by expanding their work-weeks. But the eight-hour growth to a 53-hour work-week makes future increases unrealistic... (p. 30).

He also suggested that keeping up with their field was becoming an increasingly daunting task for academics due to rapid increases in knowledge.

The average number of hours spent on direct undergraduate teaching per week was 8.4 - 9.2 (in a 1988 nationwide study of U.S. post-secondary faculty (Mingle, 1992)). Russell (1992) reported that most U.S. academics taught 9 hours per week and that this has not varied since 1975. Russell also noted that interest in teaching was declining, as research publications were needed for tenure and the amount of research contract money continued to grow.

Jordon and Layzell (1992) found that faculty in Arizona worked an average of 56 hours a week. Of this time just under 50% was spent in-class and on preparation for teaching, 33% was spent on research activity, 14% on administration, and 6% on public services. They cited a study by Glidden (1992) who found that at Pricey University College the actual workload for teaching had decreased and teaching responsibilities were being devolved to teaching assistants.

Increasing workloads are also a problem for British academics. A very recent survey by Court (1994) found the average number of hours worked per week by U.K. academics to be 54, an increase of 6% from 1969 figures. Fisher (1994) found that 75% of a sample of British academics felt frequently or always overloaded.

Staff:Student Ratios

The trends of deteriorating staff:student ratios and increasing student numbers are also evident from overseas literature.

A United Kingdom Association of University Teachers (AUT) study (1990) found an deterioration in staff:student ratios from under 1:8.5 in 1970-1975 to over 1:11.0 in 1989. There was a dramatic increase in short-term research-based contract staff, but there was little increase in the number of teaching staff, even though the numbers of students rose 38% between 1977 and 1989. Due to deteriorating staff:student ratios, "remarkable" increases in productivity since 1979 were noted by the study authors, with each university-funded member teaching 15% more students, producing 20%

more first-degree students, and also producing almost 25% more higher degree students by 1989. The authors perceived deteriorating staff:student ratios to be a threat to the quality of teaching and research.

In a recent *Times Higher Educational Supplement* article Jenkins (1993 in *THES* 4 February 1994) found significant deterioration in university staff:student ratios between 1986 and 1991 in English university geography departments. In the same article research by Gibbs (1993) which showed that students in small classes were on average getting higher marks than their counterparts in larger classes was cited. Gibbs reported that staff are being affected by lower levels of resourcing with libraries having smaller budgets, field work being pruned, and students getting less access to tutors.

This trend of deteriorating staff:student ratios is also obvious in Australia. The National Report on the Australian Higher Education Sector (1993) reported that the overall university staff:student ratio for academic staff had changed from 1:12.7 in 1987 to 1:15.3 in 1992.

Administration Staff and Salaries

Montgomery and Lewis (1994) discussed the growth of administration staff in American universities in relation to the growth in student numbers and demand for administrative services, the increase in professional staff carrying out tasks previously attended to by faculty members, and the pressures for accountability to governments, alumni, and donors. They also discussed gender and ethnicity inequalities in pay structures, citing a recent study which found that women generally received lower median salaries than men in the same university administrative positions. They cited evidence to show that those in equivalent positions in the business world generally received 10% more, and reported that there were not many opportunities in terms of career paths or promotion for administrative staff in universities.

Similarly the AUT report (1990) noted that in the U.K. national average salaries for comparable external groups were higher than the average salary for all the university occupational groups. Professors were earning 90% of their civil service equivalents, and administrative staff 83% of the nearest similar group. The authors noted that all university salaries had fallen in real terms since 1971.

Issues

Research cited by Russell (1992) reported that the most important financial issues for American State Higher Education Executive Officers were: overall level of state support (63%) and the decline in financial support (43%). The most frequently mentioned non-financial issues were: concern about public perception/accountability/effectiveness/productivity (e.g., concerns about maintaining quality of programmes while meeting the demands of a growing population and the effects of EFTS funding) (47%), and concern about access for students (25%). Faculty issues mentioned with the greatest frequency were salary (30%) and reward/promotion (25%).

Overseas Research: Stress

All University Staff

Blix *et al.* (1994) noted little agreement on definitions of occupational stress in the literature but that in general "occupational stress" refers to:

> "the inability of the individual worker to cope effectively with various work demands" (p. 158).

Perusal of the literature on occupational stress, and stress experienced by those working in universities, teaching, or library environments shows a range of factors that can contribute to stress, and some trends in the stress experienced by university staff.

The AUT study (1990) reported that 49% of members found their jobs stressful and 77% had an increase in work stress in recent years. Academic teaching, administrative, and computer staff reported stress more frequently than research, library, or other types of academic staff. There were no differences in stress reported by gender. Sources of job dissatisfaction mentioned most frequently by AUT members were: inadequate salary, inadequate resources, conflicting job demands, increasing job demands, absence of promotion prospects, and lack of public recognition of their worth.

Sharpley (1994) reported that Monash staff in Australia found the major stress factors to be: a lack of feedback on performance, a lack of promotion opportunities, worry over amalgamations, overwork, and a lack of equipment, infrastructure, or support. These are similar to areas listed in the AUT report. He also found that job stress was a problem for about 25% of all staff, more so for women than for men. He concluded that the data showed many staff were disenchanted with Monash management and procedures.

Academic Staff

Blix *et al.* (1994) reviewed the literature on work stress and concluded that most of the stress affecting university teachers involved limited resources or time. They conducted a study of occupational stress among California State University (CSU) teachers and reported that two-thirds felt stressed at least 50% of the time. Females were more likely to be stressed than males. Those who had been in their jobs for 10 years or less were more likely to suffer from burnout. Problems with stress-related health effects occurred for 48% of the teachers. Research-related activities were considered more stressful than teaching or other activities (CSU is a research-based rather than a teaching university), and 84% thought that their productivity at work had been negatively affected due to job stress. Heavy workload was the most frequently mentioned factor for considering a change of job.

In contrast to Blix *et al.* (1994), Gmelch *et al.* (1984a) found that teaching was perceived as more stressful than research in their national study of work stress in U.S. universities. They developed 5 clusters of university-specific stress factors:

1. **Reward and recognition,** e.g., inadequate recognition or reward for community service, institutional service, teaching performance, research, and unclear promotion criteria.

2. **Time constraints,** e.g., not enough time to participate in committee work, do administration, answer memos, take phone calls, attend meetings, etc.

3. **Departmental influence,** e.g., lack of personal impact on policy, difficulty of influencing chair.

4. **Professional identity**, e.g., making presentations, high self-expectations, securing financial support for research.

5. **Student interests**, e.g., evaluating students' performance, being evaluated by students, making class presentations, resolving differences with students.

In a further study of the above factors Gmelch *et al.* (1986) found that those with lower ranks, less secure tenure, women, and younger staff members were more likely to feel stressed. The "plethora of roles" that a faculty member was expected to maintain was also cited as an important source of stress.

Library Staff

Caputo (1991) looked at the relationship between work-related stress and burnout in connection with the interaction of work-related and personality-related variables. He identified a set of stress factors highly correlated with burnout.

- **Lack of professional autonomy**, e.g., sense of personal control over services provided.
- **Proportion of time spent dealing with the public**.
- **Role conflicts**, e.g., lack of fit between an individual and the job, lack of fit between individual values and job values, working for more than one supervisor, job sharing, job and personal expectations such as family responsibilities.
- **Role ambiguity**, e.g., vagueness concerning job expectations, vague directions from administration.
- **Decreasing opportunities for personal accomplishments**, e.g., related to job satisfaction and needing opportunities for research, writing, teaching activities, or collection development.
- **Inadequate level of positive feedback**, e.g., from supervisors, colleagues, or patrons.
- **Lack of control over library operations**, e.g., no say in procedures and policies.
- **No-win situations**, e.g., lack of resources, too few staff.
- **Continuous heavy workload**, e.g., too many hours, responsibilities, or repetitive tasks.
- **Deficiencies in the physical environment**, e.g., poor ventilation, noise, uncomfortable seating.

Also mentioned were personal causes of burnout (perfectionism, over-commitment, etc.), and demographic factors (gender, age, education).

In addition to the above, a set of specific library-related stresses was identified: the stereotyping of librarians, the constant need for speed in response to reference requests, censorship of library resources, clerical workload, equipment problems, theft, mutilation and destruction of library materials, lack of notice about collection development, emergency duty elsewhere, and having little say in collection development policies.

Teachers

Borg's (1990) review of the literature on occupational stress in British schools found the predominant stress-causing situations to be: pupil behaviour, workload and time pressures, working conditions, relationships with colleagues, and school ethos. Johnstone's (1993) study of Scottish teachers found that workload was described as a cause of 47% of the stress reported. "Workload" was a combined category that covered areas such as volume of work, pressures of deadlines for preparation and/or administration tasks, tasks with conflicting priorities, and the constant pressure of low-priority tasks. The other major cause of stress reported was conflict with pupils (15%). She reported that those who reported high workloads and longer hours also reported statistically higher levels of stress.

Another recent *THES* article (14 February 1994) quoted Peter Whitaker who stated that teaching is a profession in which there are, theoretically, limitless obligations. The author noted that stress occurs when there is an imbalance between an individual's inner resources and the perceived outer pressures or obligations. The author reported that occupational stress was a growing problem for workers in the education sector.

New Zealand Research

Similar to overseas trends, New Zealand university staff:student ratios are also deteriorating. *New Zealand University Summary Statistics* (Ministry of Education 1991) show a steady deterioration in the total staff:student ratio from 1:10.5 in 1980 to 1:12.5 in 1987; then a faster deterioration to 1:17.5 in 1991 (though the figures do not include the increasing number of short-term tutors for whom no national statistics are kept). This deterioration of the total staff:student ratio continued to 1:18.5 in 1993 (ratio calculated from figures in *Education Statistics of New Zealand 1994*). Figures from individual universities show the same trend, e.g., Victoria's targeted weighted average ratio is 1:15.5 but the actual average ratio deteriorated from 1:16.6 in 1989 to 1:18.7 in 1993. Otago's actual ratio was 1:14.3 in 1990 and 1:14.9 in 1993, and Canterbury's 1:15.2 in 1988 and 1:18.5 in 1993.

Recent studies of New Zealand university staff found similar sources of stress to the overseas studies. Graham (1989) reported that some new appointees at the University of Auckland had problems balancing the demands of research, teaching, and other work areas. Many chose not to do any research in their first year as they familiarised themselves with their teaching commitments. Some felt overwhelmed by administration tasks. Graham reported that these conflicts also existed for longer serving academic staff.

As overseas research often identifies female academics as experiencing more stress than their male counterparts it seems pertinent to look at any differences between the situation of male and female academics in New Zealand. Vasil (1993) reported that women academics in New Zealand are under-represented in universities' staffing profiles, are concentrated in the lower ranks, move up the academic hierarchy more slowly than males, have lower rates of research productivity and publication, were more involved in teaching as opposed to research, and were less likely to hold a doctorate than males. Vasil noted that some female academics argue that there is a gender bias in the academic reward structure.

A study by Strachan and Duirs (1993) reported that general staff women in New Zealand universities were also concentrated at the lower end of salary scales with 71% earning less than $30,000. Dissatisfaction with salary was an issue for 64% of respondents. Other issues mentioned were the expectation that tasks not contained in job descriptions would be covered, lack of career paths, dissatisfaction with promotion criteria, and undervaluing of general staff compared to academic staff.

Peters (1991) provides background information for the current situation of in New Zealand universities. Since 1987 the Vice-Chancellors have become the formal employer party in universities. Increasingly short-term contract workers have been employed to cut costs, and numbers of tenured staff dropped. This created a dual labour market with primary and secondary sectors. Lower level tasks were performed by those with lesser employment conditions. The secondary academic labour market expanded, with increasing numbers of laboratory instructors, teaching assistants, etc. Peters argued that increased teaching workloads could be demonstrated by deteriorating staff:student ratios and increased contact teaching hours since teaching 2 streams implied more marking, etc., though entry limitations on courses have been instigated to cope with the increasing workloads stemming from increases in student numbers. He suggested that, due to increased teaching loads, assessment methods had changed to less time-consuming tasks. Over half his sample of 18 academics at the University of Canterbury reported recent increases in teaching workloads. Peters suggested that, for some academics, the increased level of teaching loads had started to impinge on the quality of teaching and the amount of research time available. The Canterbury interviewees also noted that promotion rates had slowed during the last 5 years, and that this had caused a more competitive environment in departments, leading to less staff interaction. Data taken from *Education Statistics of New Zealand* (Department and Ministry of Education 1979-1990) provided empirical evidence of decreasing promotion numbers over time. Peters also presented evidence to show that New Zealand academic salaries have dropped in absolute terms and in comparison with overseas universities despite salary decreases in the U.S., Britain, and Australia. He suggested that tenure was under threat in universities and pointed out that in the 1970s and 1980s the numbers of tenured academic positions declined in British and U.S. universities.

In a survey of issues affecting academic staff at Massey University, Worth (1992) reported that most staff felt overworked and unable to restrict or limit their commitments. Deterioration in staff:student ratios placed pressures on internal teaching loads and staff felt that both their research and family lives were affected as a result. Finding a balance between teaching and research roles was a major source of conflict for staff. A survey of Lincoln University staff by Gourley (1993) also showed that nearly half of those surveyed were experiencing stress on at least 1 of the scales used.

Recent studies and overviews on other teaching professionals in New Zealand show that increasing workloads due to educational reforms are an issue for the teaching profession as a whole (Livingstone 1994, Manthei and Gilmore 1994, Wylie 1994).

Recommendations for Workload and Stress Management from the Research

A variety of recommendations were suggested by the authors mentioned in this review. The following paragraphs summarise those that have the most relevance to this study.

Graham (1989) recommended that training for both the teaching role and the research role might resolve some problems for academics. Training for teaching was also mentioned by Worth (1992) and Blix *et al.* (1994).

A solution to the problem of conflict between teaching workloads and research time suggested by Allen (1994) and Fairweather (1994) was a change in the current favouring of research and publications in promotion criteria to having 2 different but equal career tracks - one concentrating on research and the other on teaching. Fairweather comments that if teaching is the primary responsibility of a university then this should be recognised in its promotion criteria. Fisher (1994) also suggested considering three career tracks for academics: research, teaching or administration.

Sharpley (1994) suggested that to help deal with work stress prevention-oriented training programmes that were supported by management in terms of resources and staff leave-time should be made available to staff. He also recommended management-supported initiatives aimed at increasing physical and psychological health. Staff training was also recommended by other authors: stress, time and general management training (Worth 1992) and time-management, assertiveness, communications, and stress management (Blix *et al.* 1994).

Sharpley (1994) also suggested that a general commitment by management to staff-oriented thinking would ultimately enhance staff work satisfaction and productivity. Changes to management practices were also proposed by Montgomery and Lewis (1994) who suggested that, considering the current trends for higher education, academics and management would be advised to use management techniques such as Total Quality Management in order to improve staff morale and improve student "customer" satisfaction. Worth (1992) suggested improving the profile of management with academic staff.

Recommendations on managing workloads include setting formal teaching loads to counteract the problem of increasing workload (Russell 1992). Limiting academic workload, limiting the number of courses that staff members taught, decreasing staff:student ratios, and recognising the extra burden of extramural teaching were also suggested as ways of managing workload (Worth 1992).

As women staff were a group identified in the literature as experiencing stress more often than their male counterparts, some researchers made recommendations specifically for women. Worth (1992) recommended increasing the recognition and consideration of the needs of women staff members. Blix *et al.* (1994) suggested developing campus support groups for women to provide role models and opportunities for mentoring, increasing the sensitivity of university administration to women's issues and needs, and encouraging collaboration between women staff and the administration to create an academic environment more conducive to the needs and values of women staff members. Vasil (1993) also suggested providing greater institutional support for the research activities of women academics as well as paying attention to possible gender bias in the distribution of teaching responsibilities within departments.

Another group identified in the literature as experiencing higher stress were younger academics. Blix *et al.* (1994) suggested providing assistance with adjusting to diverse teacher roles, strengthening support systems, encouraging mentor systems, supporting research by providing release time and funding, and promoting collaborative research, as ways of lessening stress for younger academics.

Summary

International research shows high and increasing workloads for university staff. There is growing international concern about the effect on teaching standards of deteriorating staff:student ratios and increasing student numbers. The U.S. trend to focus on research rather than teaching is also posing problems for the quality of teaching in U.S. universities.

Similar stress factors in the university environment were identified by both overseas and New Zealand researchers: overall workload levels, lack of funding, salary levels, level of infrastructure support, lack of recognition for work, and conflict between teaching and research roles. Most studies report that females are more stressed than males. Studies also report increasing and worrying levels of work stress.

SAMPLE DESIGN

Survey Development

When looking at ways to assess the stress levels of staff in New Zealand universities the use of validated psychological stress scales was discussed. On examining the scales available, and the usefulness of the information they provided, it was decided that developing a more general questionnaire would better serve the purposes of the project considering the low reliability for the available scales and the lack of New Zealand norms. Gmelch *et al.* (1984a) noted that researchers often look for general sources of occupational stress, and by doing so fail to reflect the full character of profession specific stress. Their solution was to design a specific index for use with U.S. university faculty staff. We have adopted this solution by designing indices with items specific to each university occupational group as well as common items.

Comprehensive questionnaires for each of the 5 AUS occupational groups were developed after looking at the available research, and in consultation with AUS members in each occupational group and AUS national office staff. Overseas and New Zealand research that identified common stress factors and workload areas was utilised in order that comparisons might be made. Each questionnaire contained a selection of questions common to all occupational groups and additional questions specific to the work roles of each occupational group. Information was asked of respondents via a variety of question types: closed questions that required respondents to select from a finite number of options, open questions that required a written response, later coded, and a rating scale that required respondents to rate factors on a 1-to-5 scale. A copy of the academic and administrative support staff questionnaires are given in Appendix B. Other questionnaires are available on request from NZCER.

Questionnaire Trialling

In April 1994, a trial questionnaire for each occupational group was sent to all campuses via AUS organisers, who passed the questionnaires to 2 people from each occupational group. The total trial was 70 questionnaires; 14 for each occupational group. The trial questionnaires had a 76% return rate over all. Information from this trial was used to develop the final questionnaires.

Sampling

A systematic random sample stratified by university was selected from AUS mailing lists. In order to obtain a representative sample, different proportions of each occupational group were chosen with larger proportions selected from the smaller groups. The sample covered a third of all academics and technicians, and a half of all academic support, administrative support, and library staff from each university who were members of AUS.

Two reminder letters were sent to ensure the highest possible return rate for the survey. Tables showing the original sample and responses are given in Appendix A.

Interpretation of Tables and Statistics

Unless otherwise stated, all table percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents from each occupational group. All column percentages do not total to 100% as, for some questions, it was possible to select more than one category and 95-100% of respondents replied to most questions. Rounding of percentages may also affect column totals.

"General staff" refers to a combination of the following occupational groups: academic support, administrative support, library, and technical. Tables that report such combined data may slightly over-represent librarians, academic support, and administrative support staff. This is due to the smaller size of these occupational groups, and the fact that they were sampled in larger numbers to ensure that there would be enough respondents in each category for the purposes of statistical analysis.

Some tables report only responses given by more than 10% (in answer to open-ended questions), or 25% (in answer to closed questions). Two different cut-off points were selected, as there are fewer possible answers in a closed-option question as answers are pre-supplied, and therefore the percentages in each category are usually higher than if the question was asked in open-ended format.

Analysis

All responses to both closed or coded open-ended questions were transferred into SAS data sets, and frequencies and cross-tabulations were produced for each occupational group. Cross-tabulations were tested for significance using chi-squares. Comparisons were made between different occupational groups, among universities, among academic and general staff, and by gender. Workload increases, stress levels, full- and part-time status, and salary were also used as comparison variables.

Response Characteristics

Total questionnaires returned were 1181 (66%). Return rates by occupational group were: 71% each for academic support staff and administrative support staff, 69% for librarians, and 65% each for technicians and academic staff. Response rates by university were: Lincoln 74%, Auckland 68%, Otago 67%, Massey, Canterbury, and Victoria 66% each, and Waikato 62%.

Sample Representativeness

To gauge whether the survey return was representative of all AUS members, and university staff as a whole, the responses were checked against available information on the distribution of the AUS membership by university and by gender, and against Ministry of Education figures for the distribution of academic staff positions. These comparisons show that the survey responses are representative of AUS members, with some overrepresentation of female technical staff (41% in responses compared with 32% for the AUS membership), and of associate professors/professors/deans (33% in responses compared with 27% in Ministry of Education figures for academic staff). (*See* Tables 46, 47, and 48 in Appendix A.)

RESULTS

1 - WORK HOURS, WORK STATUS, AND SALARY

Employment Status

The majority of respondents were employed full time: 92% of academics, 91% of technicians, 88% of academic support, and 84% of administrative support and librarians. Most were employed on a permanent basis as shown by Table 1.

Table 1

Type of Contract

Type	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Permanent	87	84	85	96	93
Limited-term	11	15	12	2	6
Other	2	-	2	1	-

Table 2 shows the length of contracts for the few respondents who reported that they were employed on a limited-term basis.

Table 2

Term of Contract

Length	Academic N = 62	Academic support N = 12	Admin. support N = 13	Library N = 7	Technical N = 16
0-5 months	-	-	-	1	-
6-11 months	2	1	-	2	-
1-2 years	17	6	7	-	8
3-4 years	34	3	5	3	7
Other	9	2	1	1	1

Academic staff tended to have been in university employment for longer than general staff as shown by Table 3.

Table 3
Total Length of Time in University Employment

Years	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
0-5 years	16	40	44	49	23
6-10 years	16	**33**	**32**	**22**	**29**
11-20 years	**28**	15	20	20	29
21-30 years	34	11	4	9	16
More than 30 years	6	1	-	1	2

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

The average length of time in their current position was 5-6 years for most respondents.

Table 4
Length of Time in Present Position

Years	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Less than 1 year	8	9	6	19	5
1-2 years	12	21	27	17	12
3-4 years	15	**27**	**20**	**26**	23
5-6 years	9	9	16	15	**15**
7-8 years	**12**	18	14	6	15
More than 8 years	43	17	16	16	30

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

Average Hours Worked Per Week

The estimated average number of hours worked each week by each occupational group was: academics (53), academic support (44), administrative support (41), technical (40), and library (39). These figures suggest that general staff are working consistently longer hours than the 37.5 hours per week required by their contracts. Table 5 shows the average hours worked each week by full-time members of each occupational group.

Table 5

Average Hours Worked Per Week by Full-time Respondents

Hours	Academic N = 508 %	Academic support N = 72 %	Admin. support N = 92 %	Library N = 154 %	Technical N = 229 %
Less than 30 hours	1	-	1	2	1
30-34 hours	2	-	8	6	3
35-39 hours	3	18	39	**53**	**47**
40-44 hours	11	**46**	**36**	27	34
45-49 hours	20	25	7	9	13
50-54 hours	**23**	4	5	2	3
55-59 hours	19	4	-	-	-
60-64 hours	13	-	3	-	-
65-70 hours	5	-	-	1	-
More than 70 hours	5	3	-	-	-

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

Work Outside University Hours

All respondents were asked whether they took work home in the evenings and whether they worked in the weekends (excluding shift work): 90% of academics, 50% of academic support staff, 23% of technicians, 20% of librarians, and 15% of administrative staff indicated that they took work home on 1 evening or more a week. In addition 69% of librarians, 53% of technicians, 50% of administrative support staff, 45% of academic support staff, and 8% of academics indicated that they took work home occasionally during the year. Figures for staff who never took work home are 42% of librarians, 35% of administrative staff, 23% of technicians, and only 4% of academic support staff and 1% of academics.

Eighty-four percent of academics, 42% of academic support staff, 19% of technicians, and 13% of both librarians and administrative support staff reported that they worked on 1 or more weekends a month. Occasional weekend work was reported by 48% of academic support staff, 44% of technicians, 33% of administrative support staff, 24% of librarians, and 14% of academics. Sixty-three percent of librarians, 49% of administrative support staff, 35% of technicians, 10% of academic support staff, and no academics reported they never worked on weekends.

Average Salary of Full-time Staff

The average salary of respondents differed across occupational groups. Average salaries of male and female full-time workers were compared to assess whether there were any differences by gender within occupational groups. Female academics were more likely to earn less than $50,001 compared with their male colleagues (chisq = 75.15, $p < .001$, df = 1). Female administrative and technical staff were more likely to earn less than $30,001 compared with males (chisq = 8.25, $p < .01$, df = 1 and chisq = 5.40, $p < .05$, df = 1). A similar trend was evident for academic support staff but the numbers were too small for this to be significant. There was no obvious trend for library staff. The location of female staff at the lower end of salary scales was also reported by Strachan and Duirs (1993).

Table 6
Average Salary of Full-time Respondents

Salary	Academic N = 504 %	Academic support N = 72 %	Admin. support N = 90 %	Library N = 148 %	Technical N = 229 %
Less than $20,001	-	-	1	1	3
$20,001-$30,000	-	7	**64**	**56**	30
$30,001-$40,000	4	33	21	27	**61**
$40,001-$50,000	22	**35**	9	9	6
$50,001-$60,000	10	14	3	4	-
$60,001-$70,000	**37**	7	-	-	-
More than $70,000	26	4	-	-	-

Note - the median category for each occupational group is highlighted.

Adequacy of Salary

The majority of respondents did not feel that their salary adequately reflected their work as shown by Table 7. Academic staff earning less than $50,001, academic support staff earning less than $40,001, and technicians, librarians, and administrative support staff earning less than $30,001 were more likely to feel inadequately paid. (For academics: chisq = 5.60, $p < .05$, df = 1; for general staff chisq = 9.37, $p < .01$, df = 1.) Otherwise, academics were on the whole more likely to say that their salary adequately reflected their work compared with the other groups (chisq = 44.42, $p < .001$, df = 1).

Table 7
Views of Salary Adequacy in Relation to Work

View	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Adequate	32	23	13	16	17
Inadequate	54	61	82	68	72
Not sure	14	15	6	14	9

In addition to stating how they viewed the adequacy of their salary respondents were invited to comment if they so wished. These comments were divided into the categories presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Comments on Salary Adequacy

Comment	Academic N = 264 %	Academic support N = 50 %	Admin. support N = 54 %	Library N = 102 %	Technical N = 121 %
Does not reflect responsibilities	27	22	46	64	47
Does not reflect workload/hours worked	17	16	24	22	16
Could earn more outside university	24	34	17	8	20
A salary rise is needed	*	2	13	11	11
Difficult to get a promotion	*	6	2	9	4
Salary inconsistent across universities	*	6	7	1	1
Content with salary/paid enough	16	6	9	5	4
Other issues are more important	12	8	-	-	2
Salary not comparable to overseas	14	*	*	*	*
Salary comparable to other N.Z. salaries	7	*	*	*	*
Other comments	11	18	-	7	8

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Summary

Most respondents were employed full-time and permanently, a situation that provides a reasonable level of job security. Most respondents worked longer than their contracted hours and a reasonably large proportion worked in the evenings, and at weekends, though there was some variation between occupational groups with academics most likely to take work home regularly.

Figures for the average hours per week worked by academics are very similar to those reported in the literature review for overseas academics.

Most university staff do not feel they are adequately paid. Staff in the lowest paid occupational groups and those at the lowest end of the salary range for their group were more likely to be dissatisfied with their salary compared with their higher paid colleagues.

2 - RESPONSIBILITIES

Teaching Responsibilities

Ninety-eight percent of academics, 67% of technicians, 54% of librarians, and 41% of academic support staff taught or instructed students.

Academic Staff

Full-time academics had overall responsibility for 1 to 10 courses in 1994, with an average of 3 courses each. Six percent of academics did not have responsibility for any courses and 4% did not answer the question. They taught in anything from 1 to 15 undergraduate courses, the average being 4 courses per year. Three percent of academics did not have any involvement in undergraduate courses per year and 4% did not answer the question.

On average the number of postgraduate tutorials given by full-time academics per year was 18, with a range of 1 to 200. Fifteen percent of academics did not have any involvement in postgraduate seminars and 9% did not answer the question. They supervised up to 70 postgraduate students, the average being 5 students; 16% did not supervise any postgraduate students.

Full-time academics who taught undergraduate classes reported spending an average of 6.7 hours per week on direct contact teaching, with a range of 0.2 to 30 hours. For postgraduate teaching the average was 3.4 hours per week, and the range 0.25 to 30 hours. In total, direct contact teaching hours per week were 10.1 on average. The total figure for average contact hours per week is similar to figures reported in overseas literature.

Not many academics (16%) were involved in staff training or induction courses. For full-time staff the average number of sessions was 2, and the range of sessions 1 to 30.

Academic Support Staff

Of the academic support staff responding to the survey, 37% gave some type of formal instruction to undergraduates and 26% to postgraduates. Full-time staff gave an average of 8 undergraduate classes per year; the number of sessions varied from 1 to 60. Full-time staff gave an average of 3 postgraduate classes per year; the number of sessions given ranged from 1 to 20.

Forty-three percent of academic support staff were involved in staff training or induction courses (an average of 8 sessions per year for full-time staff; the number of sessions ranged from 1 to 140).

Administrative Support Staff

Twenty-three percent of administrative support staff contributed to staff training courses. For full-time staff this meant an average of 8 courses per year. The number of courses they worked on, varied from 1 to 90.

Library Staff

Fifty-two percent of librarians reported that they took undergraduates for library tours or bibliographic instruction, and 30% instructed postgraduates. Full-time staff gave an average of 22 undergraduate and 18 postgraduate tours per year. The number of tours or sessions given by full-time staff varied from 1 to more than 100 for both undergraduates and postgraduates.

Thirty-nine percent of librarians contributed to staff training courses; for full-time staff this meant an average of 5 courses per year, and the number of sessions varied from 1 to 25.

Technical Staff

Fifty-three percent of technicians reported that they provided support to undergraduate courses and 55% assisted postgraduate students. Full-time staff assisted in an average of 5 undergraduate courses (ranging from 1 to 40), and supported an average of 18 postgraduate students per year (ranging from 1 to 300 with 1 person stating support for 1200 students).

Eighteen percent of technicians contributed to staff training courses. For full-time staff this meant an average of 2 courses per year. The number of courses technical staff were involved in varied from 1 to 6.

Student Numbers

Tables 9 and 10 show the minimum and maximum numbers of students taught in any one course or class by respondents with teaching responsibilities.

Table 9

Minimum Number of Students Taught or Assisted in Any One Course

Number of students	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
1-10	21	**20**	**41**	15
11-20	19	10	7	8
21-30	**12**	4	1	**13**
31-40	11	1	-	4
41-50	7	1	1	3
51-60	6	1	1	3
61-70	3	-	-	1
71-80	3	-	1	-
81-90	1	-	-	1
91 or more	12	1	-	6
Do not teach	4	54	39	21

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

Table 10
Maximum Number of Students Taught or Assisted in Any One Course

	Academic	Academic support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 184	N = 253
Number of students	%	%	%	%
1-20	2	11	**29**	8
21-40	6	4	7	10
41-60	9	**7**	4	6
61-80	11	5	1	**4**
81-100	9	-	3	7
101-200	**26**	5	2	10
201-300	14	2	2	4
301-400	7	1	1	3
401-500	3	3	-	1
501 or more	9	-	1	2
Do not teach	5	54	39	20

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

Workload Responsibilities

Respondents were asked what proportion of time they spent on a number of key work areas identified for each occupational group. An estimate of the average time spent on each key area was calculated for each occupational group. Due to rounding these estimates do not all sum to 100%.

Academic Staff
Academics spent on average: 48% of their time on teaching, 23% on research, 21% on internal administration and meetings, and 8% on other areas.

Academic Support Staff
For academic support staff the time breakdown was as follows: providing professional services, planning, or liaison for students, staff, and others: 43% of time; providing technical or computer services 35%; administration 14%; and other areas 9%.

Administrative Support Staff
Administrative support staff spent an average of 34% of their time providing support or information to students, staff, and other clients, 26% on word-processing, photocopying, etc., 19% on internal administration and meetings, and 21% on other areas.

Library Staff
Library staff spent an average of 45% of their time on general non-contact library duties, 33% on customer service, 13% on internal administration and meetings, and 8% on other areas.

Technical Staff
Technical staff spent an average of 28% of their time providing technical support for teaching, 30% providing technical support for research, 21% on general technical services, 14% on internal administration and meetings, and 8% on other areas.

Summary

Respondents from all groups spent the majority of their time servicing students or staff by either teaching, preparing for teaching, or responding to inquiries or requests. Respondents from all groups also spent 13-21% of their time on internal administration. A sizable proportion of 4 of the occupational groups spent time teaching students. A large proportion of academic support staff were also involved in staff training. The data in this survey show much similarity with overseas research on the proportion of time academics spend in each work area, and the amount of time spent on contact teaching.

3 - CHANGES

As well as seeking data to build up a picture of the current work situation and responsibilities of respondents, questions were asked in order to assess whether there had been any recent changes to these areas.

Changes to Total Workload

The majority of respondents (81%) said their workload had increased in recent years. There were no significant differences between occupational groups in the numbers reporting increases.

Table 11
Changes to Total Workload in Recent Years

Change	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Increased	80	85	78	76	85
About the same	13	7	11	10	11
Decreased	1	-	4	1	1
Other	1	2	3	3	1

Academic and general staff at each university were compared to assess whether increases to workload levels varied by university and between the 2 groups. General staff at Canterbury were more likely to say that their workload had stayed the same when compared with other general staff groups (chisq = 4.78, $p < .05$, df = 1). There were no significant differences between universities for academic staff. No significant differences were found between academic and general staff within universities. This indicates that the impact of changes at the national level to funding and administration have been felt similarly throughout the country.

Table 12
Increases to Workload by University

University	Academic Staff N = 551 %	General Staff N = 628 %	Total N = 1179 %
Auckland	84	84	84
Waikato	80	79	79
Massey	70	75	72
Victoria	83	84	83
Canterbury	79	74	76
Lincoln	92	83	89
Otago	80	85	83

Changes to Workload Areas

Respondents were given a list of work areas previously identified as common to members of their occupational group, and asked to state whether their workload in each work area had changed by selecting from the following list of categories: "Increased", "Stayed about the same", "Decreased", "Not sure", and "Not part of workload". As Table 13 shows, increases in workload were most common.

Table 13

Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases and Decreases in Work Areas

Common general work areas	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Administration/meetings	+57	+51	+26	+42	+51
Professional development	-21	+6	+31	+37	+29
Student contact/teaching					
Support/services to students	+62	+50	+40	+53	*
Course/lecture planning	+61	*	*	*	*
Postgraduate supervision	+44	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	+38	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	+30	*	*	*	*
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	+41
Instruction/induction	*	+34	+10	+23	*
Research					
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	+35
Research/writing/publishing	-8	*	*	*	+10
Non-common general work areas					
Support/services to staff	*	+61	+57	+40	*
Support/services to external clients	*	+25	+39	+25	*
Word-processing	*	*	+38	*	*
Technical or computer services	*	+49	*	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	+12	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	+50	*
General technical services	*	*	*	*	+39
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	+40
Consultation/professional services	+14	*	*	*	+33
Other areas	+9	+16	+42	+20	+23

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
+ indicates a higher percentage selecting "Increased".
- indicates a higher percentage selecting "Decreased".

Tables reporting the actual percentages of those selecting the categories "Increased", "Decreased", and "Staying about the same" are included in Appendix A.

The work areas in which the largest numbers of respondents reported increases were administration and meetings, providing support and services to students, providing support and services to staff (for general staff), and course and lecture preparation (for academics). Other areas mentioned more often as increasing were providing services or consultations for outside clients.

The only 2 areas in which more respondents reported decreases in workload compared with increases were professional development and research, writing, and publishing for academics.

Expected Changes to Workload in the Future

In total 55% of respondents thought it was likely that their workload would increase in the future. Academics were less likely to think this than other groups (chisq = 76.07, $p < .001$, df = 2). This may be because academics have already reached the limit of the hours they are prepared to work as suggested by Allen (1994) in his study of U.S. academics.

Table 14

Expected Workload Levels in Future

Expected change	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Increase	47	78	66	62	56
None	36	13	8	17	16
Decrease	6	-	4	2	2
Not sure	12	7	19	20	27

Changes to the Number of Requests for Services

All academic support staff, 91% of administrative support staff, 80% of librarians, and 39% of technicians serviced requests from students, staff, and clients outside their university. Respondents who serviced requests were asked if they had noticed any changes to the volume of requests they received from these 3 groups.

Academic Support Staff

Of the 69 academic support staff who serviced student requests, 69% had noticed an increase in requests. Of the 77 who serviced staff requests, 68% had noticed an increase, as did 52% of the 67 who serviced outside clients.

Administrative Support Staff

Of the 79 administrative support staff who serviced student requests, 66% had noticed increases. Increases were noted by 73% of the 95 servicing staff requests, and 56% of the 80 servicing outside clients.

Library Staff

Of the 146 library staff who serviced student requests, 84% had noticed an increase in requests. Of the 143 servicing staff requests, 68% noted an increase, as did 51% of the 147 servicing outside clients.

Technical Staff

Eighty-two percent of the 92 technicians who provided general technical services reported that they had experienced an increase in the number of requests for their services.

Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed

The majority of survey respondents who instructed or taught students had experienced an increase in student numbers.

Table 15

Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed

Change	Academic N = 505 %	Academic support N = 33 %	Library N = 82 %	Technical N = 179 %
Increased - large amount	41	27	34	45
Increased - small amount	30	24	27	31
Stayed the same	18	15	22	13
Decreased - small amount	4	1	-	-
Decreased - large amount	2	-	4	3
Varies	5	9	4	7
Not sure	1	15	10	2

Changes to Work Situation

Respondents were asked whether they had noticed any changes in recent years to a range of elements within their work situation. Table 16 shows the net percentage difference between those reporting an improvement compared with a deterioration in each element. (The actual percentage figures for "Improvement", "No change", and "Deterioration" are included in Appendix A.)

While teaching and the quality of services being provided tended to be rated as improving, university management was rated as deteriorating, as were the overall quality of working life and the level and method of funding.

Views on changes to the quality of their working life differed between groups. Academics were more likely to indicate a deterioration compared with other groups (chisq = 42.67, $p < .001$, df = 1).

Table 16

Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement and Deterioration in Work Situation

Quality of	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Resources/equipment	+27	+52	+40	+60	+30
Services provided	*	+39	+54	+57	+38
Instruction/teaching	+24	+27	*	+39	*
Student evaluations of teaching	+20	*	*	*	*
Performance reviews/appraisals	+9	+11	-7	+25	+5
Admin./organisation in area	+7	+1	+20	+19	+3
Interactions with outside clients	+4	+9	+23	+9	+16
Work environment (space/light)	+3	+10	+10	+30	-6
Interactions with students	+2	+17	+19	+31	+13
Research	-1	*	*	*	*
Interactions with other uni. staff	-12	+5	+36	+28	+17
Interactions with colleagues	-17	+15	+31	+24	+21
Overall university management	-35	-25	-22	-8	-27
Working life in general	-46	-30	-9	-1	-15
Other areas					
Level of funding for area	*	-4	-13	+3	-28
Method of funding for area	*	-10	-11	-9	-15
Method of funding for teaching	-12	*	*	*	*
Career/promotion prospects	-17	-10	-12	-5	-12
Level of funding for research	-22	*	*	*	*
Ability to exercise academic freedom	-23	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	-27	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for research	-29	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	-31	*	*	*	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
+ = indicates a higher percentage reporting improvement.
- = indicates a higher percentage reporting deterioration.

Summary

Workloads increased for most respondents. The majority of respondents also thought that their workload was likely to increase in the future.

On the whole, workload increases were across-the-board for almost all respondents in all work areas. The work areas in which the majority of respondents noticed increases were support and services to students (academic, academic support, and library staff), support and services to staff (academic support and administrative support staff), course and lecture planning (for academics), internal administration (academic, academic support, and technical staff), and non-contact library duties (for library staff).

The majority of respondents also reported an increase in the numbers of students they taught, instructed, or assisted.

Academics reported that they were spending less time on professional development, research, writing, and publishing. This has implications for the quality of teaching, research, and planning if less time is available for keeping up to date. For academics, another change to their work situation has been deteriorating relationships with other university staff members. This is not the case for members of the other occupational groups.

Despite an increase in workload and student requests, respondents were more likely to say that the quality of the services they provided had improved, though this increase in quality may well be at the expense of the quality of respondents' working life in general, or due to an increase in hours worked. A large proportion of each group reported improvements to resources and equipment, and it is likely that some of the improvements to services are due to this increased resourcing. It is also likely that respondents were unwilling to report that teaching standards or the quality of services they provide had declined, though concerns about declining quality emerged elsewhere in the survey. As described in the introductory section, university staff are working longer hours than previously; respondents to this survey also appear to be doing more within their working hours in order to keep up with the demands of a growing number of students. This situation cannot continue indefinitely, and it is likely that at some stage the quality of teaching and other services will start to deteriorate as suggested in overseas research.

Declining funding, and deterioration in the management of funding and overall university management are issues for respondents from all occupational groups.

4 - REASONS FOR CHANGES

Reasons for Changes to Workload

Respondents listed a variety of reasons for changes to their workload, the most common for all occupational groups being increasing numbers of students. On average most respondents suggested 2 reasons for changes to their workload. The 3 most frequently mentioned reasons are highlighted for each group. Table 17 presents a categorical analysis of the areas mentioned by more than 10% of the respondents from each occupational group.

Table 17
Reasons for Workload Changes

Reason	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Increases in student numbers/demands	**41**	**41**	**32**	**45**	**43**
Increases in administration	**34**	18	r	r	17
Increases in course preparation	**30**	*	r	*	*
Increased/new responsibilities	17	17	18	20	20
Staffing changes/issues	13	**28**	**21**	18	**28**
Increases in research/consultancies	14	*	*	*	13
Reviews/restructuring/new systems	11	15	**25**	15	11
New technology	*	**32**	13	**35**	**21**
Increased profile of services	*	21	*	*	*
Increase in volume of work	*	15	20	**28**	18
Other	18	r	r	r	13

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes factors that were mentioned by 10% or fewer of an occupational group.

The following are examples of typical reasons for workload changes given by respondents:

Academic	*Increased student numbers - more marking, more tutoring (and larger class size which is not in the interests of the students). [More] administration due to devolution.*
Academic support	*There has been a vast uptake of computing at the university; for example, the number of PCs on campus has at least quadrupled since 1989. The computer industry is changing at a faster pace. Student numbers have increased maybe 75% since 1989.*
Administrative support	*Increased responsibility and functions; audit requirements. Growing workload from government changes, increased student numbers, growing diversity of courses offered without sufficient attention to rationalisation. Increased pressure for new activities - often useful - but time consuming, e.g., staff development, harassment seminars, privacy.*

Library	*The introduction of computers, increased student numbers, fewer staff to do the same amount of work.*
Technical	*Increase in student numbers, no increase to technical staff. Also increasing amount of work "passed on" by academics who used to do their own work. Slow replacement of lost staff means short-term large workload increases.*

Reasons for Changes to Work Situation

Respondents were asked to identify the reasons for any changes to their work situation from a list of 17 possible options. Table 18 presents the factors most often selected (25% or more of members of each occupational group indicated that the factor contributed to changes to their situation), and those least selected (10% or less indicated that the factor had contributed to change). Only 1-2% of members of each occupational group stated that they had noticed no changes to their work situation. Similarly only 0-2% indicated that they were not sure about what had caused changes to their work situation.

The majority of general staff and academics selected the same 3 reasons: increases in workload, responsibilities, and student numbers; these 3 reasons are highlighted in Table 18.

Table 18
Reasons for Work Situation Changes

Most often selected reasons	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Increases in workload	**70**	**71**	**67**	**67**	**71**
Increases in student numbers	**61**	**54**	**59**	**65**	**56**
Increases in job responsibilities	**58**	**59**	**67**	**67**	**64**
New or changed equipment	p	40	32	56	34
New or changed buildings	p	28	25	45	35
Changes to university management	39	33	25	25	25
Changes to output requirements	37	p	30	p	p
Organisational changes in area	32	40	36	26	43
Requirements of new legislation	29	p	26	p	37
Changes to funding of area	26	30	p	p	32
Working with different people	p	p	30	27	p
Change in job position	p	p	p	29	p
Least often selected reasons					
Effect of Employment Contracts Act	10	p	p	p	p
Requirements of new legislation	p	p	p	9	p
Decreases in workload	2	-	2	1	1
Decreases in job responsibilities	2	1	2	3	1
Decreases in student numbers	2	-	-	1	1

p denotes factors that were selected by less than 25%, or more than 10%, of an occupational group.

While most general staff and academics reported an increase in responsibilities, few noted that their actual job position had changed. This indicates either that staff were not being formally rewarded for increased work and responsibilities by promotion, or that turnover is slow. Many general and academic staff also indicated that they did not feel adequately paid for the level of responsibility their job entailed (*see* page 21).

Balance in Workload

When asked if they were content with the balance of work areas in their workload, 79% of academics indicated that they would prefer more research time, as did 30% of technical staff. Thirty-three percent of academic support staff, 25% of technical staff, and 23% of administrative support staff responding would prefer to spend more time on providing services; 25% of library staff would prefer more customer contact time. Twenty-five percent of academics indicated that they would prefer less, and 10% more, teaching time. Research by Russell (1992) found 50% of U.S. academics would like more research time, 90% would like the same amount or less teaching time, and 90% would like the same amount or less administration.

Only 2% of technical staff and 4% of the other general staff indicated that they would prefer less time on providing general services, and only 2% of technicians and no academics stated the same for research. A full breakdown of these figures is provided in Appendix A.

Table 19 shows reactions to the weight presently given to administrative work in university workloads.

Table 19
Balance in Workload

Preference for use of time	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Content with present work balance	12	35	26	52	32
Less administration	44	24	5	5	21
More administration	2	18	33	8	7

Over all, academics were least content with the time given to different aspects of their work, (chisq = 99.61, $p < .001$, df = 1).

Training

Respondents were asked if they felt they had been given enough training in the following 5 work areas: the everyday requirements of their job, new responsibilities, new technology and equipment, new administration and procedures, and university restructuring.

The majority of respondents indicated that they had received enough training on the everyday requirements of their job, but large proportions reported that they had not received enough training on, or were unsure about, university restructuring. This suggests that information on policies and restructuring is not filtering down the hierarchy.

Table 20 displays the net percentage differences between those who considered that their training was adequate compared with those who did not. Tables reporting the actual percentages for adequate training, inadequate training, and other responses are located in Appendix A.

Table 20

Net Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training

Training area	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Everyday requirements of job	+33	+21	+48	+50	+43
New job responsibilities	+3	-17	+16	+20	+4
New technology/computers/equipment	-6	-2	+8	+3	-24
New admin./procedure requirements	-22	-12	-6	+16	-5
University restructuring and devolution	-29	-23	-20	-5	-29

+ indicates a higher percentage selecting "Adequate".
- indicates a higher percentage selecting "Inadequate".

Summary

Universities are currently experiencing rapid changes. Only 1-2% of respondents from each occupational group stated that they had noticed no alterations to their working situation. A wide array of changes were noticed in the university environment: general increases in workload and the volume of work to get through; changes in the numbers of students and staff; changes to work environment in terms of space, buildings, equipment, and new technology; changes to the general management environment; and changes to departmental or area organisation.

It appears that there is very little in the university system that is currently staying constant. Most respondents reported changes to their job responsibilities but not in their job positions. Training for changes is keeping up in some areas and lagging in others, particularly new administration and management procedures and university restructuring.

5 - IMPACTS OF CHANGES

Respondents were asked about the impacts of any changes to their workload and student numbers, and how these factors had influenced their work situation.

Impact on Workloads

The majority of general staff (87%) who had experienced increased requests for services over the last few years reported that these changes had increased their workload.

Table 21
Impact of Change on Number of Requests for Services

Impact	Academic support N = 70 %	Admin. support N = 72 %	Library N = 145 %	Technical N = 95 %
Increased workload	87	84	87	92
No impact	4	9	8	4
Decreased workload	1	-	1	-
Not sure	7	8	4	4

For all groups most comments also centred on the fact that increasing numbers of requests had increased workloads. Other comments focused on: jobs changing to cope with the changing nature or number of requests; changing staff, management, and procedures; and problems with completing work on time.

Academic support	*Both the numbers and the complexity of the requests have increased so that the total workload is very much increased - also more preparation time is needed.*
Administrative support	*The increase has made it more difficult to get work on hand completed because of the interruptions. The increase has tipped the balance.*
Library	*Number of interloan requests I service for our library clients has increased 300% over the last 4 years.*
Technical	*My section is now performing tasks not done in '89 - dealing with venues and equipment which did not exist in '89.*

Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed

Of the respondents who taught or instructed students, 87% stated that increasing student numbers have increased their workload.

Table 22

Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed

Impact	Academic N = 378 %	Academic support N = 25 %	Library N = 63 %	Technical N = 148 %
Increased workload	90	68	70	92
No impact	6	28	17	5
Decreased workload	1	-	-	-
Not sure	2	4	13	3

The themes most often mentioned in respondents' comments were: spending more time on course marking and administration (31% of academics); responding to an increasing number of student requests and queries (26% of technicians and 17% of academics); general increases to workload (19% of librarians), running more tutorials and classes (17% of librarians, 16% of academic support, and 7% of academics); increasing class sizes (12% of academics), spending more time on new course development (9% of academics), and making more use of tutors (3% of academics). The following are examples of the types of comments given:

Academic	*Fourth year class has doubled from 25 to 50 students - it is very tutorial intensive [leading to a] large increase in workload - will have to alter teaching methods (reduce quality) next year.*
Academic support	*Because of student demand for the seminars we offer, we now have to offer more.*
Library	*Bibliographic instruction once confined to 3-4 staff is now being shared amongst 10 or more people.*
Technical	*Larger classes for every course/greater stress on material resources and my gathering of them. Time stresses when undergraduate classes overlap continually with postgraduate requirements of my time. This is because there are more lab streams per course and more postgraduates.*

Other Impacts of Changes to Workload

When asked to comment on the impact of changes to their workload, 76% of academic support, 74% of academics, 72% of librarians, 67% of administrative support staff, and 62% of technicians listed 2 impacts on average. Table 23 shows the impacts mentioned by more than 10% of respondents. (A table displaying the comments made by 10% or less of respondents in located in Appendix A.)

Table 23

Impact of Workload Changes

Impact	Academic N = 441 %	Academic support N = 62 %	Admin. support N = 74 %	Library N = 133 %	Technical N = 157 %
Less time for research/professional development/planning	56	37	*	*	*
Decrease in leisure time	28	*	*	*	*
More stress/pressure	28	35	15	45	32
Work/teaching standards decreasing	20	26	14	19	20
More hours worked/lack of time	17	56	51	41	47
Change in job priorities	*	r	15	13	15
More deadlines/interruptions/requests	r	r	15	r	18
More new technology/computers	*	r	r	27	r
Less job satisfaction	11	23	r	r	r
More administration/meetings	r	r	18	r	r
More job satisfaction	r	r	r	r	11

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes categories that were mentioned by 10% or fewer of an occupational group.

A few respondents from each group stated that changes to their workload had increased their enjoyment of their job, though they were in the minority (11% of technicians, 6% of academics, 4% each of administrative support staff and librarians, and 3% of academic support staff).

The following are examples of typical comments on workload changes:

Academic	*Less research - and oddly - less personal contact with students. None of us now tutor at stage 1 which is tragic and we've had to cut back on tutorials and only offer them fortnightly. Postgrads fear to disrupt us when we are busy. That's bad too.*
Academic support	*Unable to keep up with new developments; unable to do some things as well as we ought to; unable to be proactive.*
Administrative support	*Less time to spend on any individual task. Greater level of organisation and number of subordinate staff.*
Library	*Have to juggle priorities, and leave some things undone until time available to do them. Increased stress.*
Technical	*Longer hours - at least 1-1½ hours per day. Less time to sort out problems i.e., more stopgap solutions with lower standards of work. Safety considerations are overlooked.*

Impact of Changes to University Structure and Management

Respondents were asked to describe the impact, on their work situation, of changes to university structure and management in recent years. Table 24 presents a categorical analysis of comments made by more than 10% of the members of any particular occupational group who responded to this question. (A table of the comments made by 10% or less is available in Appendix A.)

Table 24

Impact of Change to University Structure and Management

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 408	N = 57	N = 70	N = 100	N = 143
Impact	%	%	%	%	%
More administrative requirements	40	23	20	14	25
Poor management/communication	24	14	r	14	r
Less funding for/emphasis on research	17	*	*	*	*
Lack of funding for area	*	25	17	30	28
Increased management authority/power	17	16	r	r	r
Commercialisation of university	13	11	r	r	20
Increased workload	r	18	20	18	14
Lack of recognition of staff	r	12	20	15	13
More student demands/numbers	r	r	20	15	r
Improvements to management/policies	r	r	r	11	r

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes categories that were mentioned by 10% or fewer of an occupational group.

The following are typical examples of comments made by respondents:

Academic	*To put it colloquially, registry seems to be "dumping" administrative work on academic staff. Also with increasing "user-pays", students (some) can make unrealistic demands under the guise of getting "value for money". Recent and proposed changes to the structure of tertiary education in N.Z. means that we (academics) are under increasing pressure from management to increase EFTSs at the expense of academic quality.*
Academic support	*Better accountability; more wasteful, poorly planned and implemented administrative procedures, cumbersome financial control; less meaningful consultation with administrators.*
Administrative support	*Reduced opportunities for professional development, career enhancement, and salary increments. Job-sizing exercise will no doubt undermine employment security. Less value placed on staff and their qualifications. Total lack of interest in personal development. The feeling that general staff are expendable and second-class citizens.*

Library	*More formal requests from the university administration to provide assistance with changes and reporting/output requirements. Requirements of new legislation to do tasks previously undertaken by general university administrators, yet without improvements of quality to financial statements. Need to accept large budget cuts; meet increasing user demands with better service yet on lower resources to the point at which "true quality service' is not feasible.*
Technical	*Restructuring of university finances with the appointment of a central financial controller and his many assistants. The creation of "divisions" which has imposed an additional layer of bureaucracy for decision-making, paperwork generation, and slowing up of administration tasks.*

Impact on Personal and Family Life

Respondents were asked to indicate whether changes to their work had an impact on their personal health and private life. Between 26% and 32% of the members of each occupational group noted that the quality of their physical health had deteriorated, and 35% to 45% reported deterioration in their emotional health. The quality of family life had deteriorated for between 16% to 36%. Of the academics, 61% reported that the quality of their leisure activities had deteriorated as a result of changes to their work situation, as did between 24% to 44% of the members of the other occupational groups.

Fifteen percent of librarians and up to 7% of the members of the other occupational groups indicated that there had been improvements to their health or life outside of work due to work-related changes.

Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses

In total, 29% of respondents stated that they had suffered from a work-related injury or a stress-related illness while being employed in a New Zealand university.

Table 25

Respondents Experiencing Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses While in University Employment

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Experience of illness or injury	%	%	%	%	%
Work-related illness or injury	26	26	34	30	32
No work-related illness or injury	63	56	61	61	61
Not sure	10	16	5	7	4

Respondents who had experienced a work-related injury or stress illness were asked to describe their experiences. There were differences related to occupation: technicians, due to their work with various types of equipment, were more likely to have a work-related accident. Librarians tended to suffer occupational overuse syndrome from carrying heavy books and keyboard work. Occupational overuse syndrome was also the major problem reported by administrative support staff, as the next table shows.

Table 26

Work-related Injuries and Stress Illnesses

Injury or Illness	Academic N = 164 %	Academic support N = 28 %	Admin. support N = 36 %	Library N = 63 %	Technical N = 83 %
General stress effects (e.g., insomnia)	35	36	28	14	16
RSI/OOS/back pains	27	32	44	62	33
Serious illness (e.g., heart attack)	16	11	3	2	7
Psychological illness	16	14	8	5	7
General illness/feeling run down	13	25	19	16	7
Work-related accidents	13	4	17	22	51
Health professional noted stress effects	2	7	-	-	4
Other	4	4	-	-	1

Summary

The major impacts of workload changes were more time pressures and more hours worked in total. Respondents felt under more pressure, and more stressed. Academics had less time for research and professional development. This has implications for the long-term quality of research and teaching work. The deterioration of work standards due to increased workload was a concern for respondents from all occupational groups.

Increases to workload levels also had other personal impacts. Substantial proportions of all occupational groups surveyed indicated that workload changes had affected their physical and emotional health, family relationships, and leisure activities.

Changes to work situations due to changes to university structure and management were usually described in negative terms. Many respondents reported that changes had increased their workload and the amount of administration they were required to do. Many also thought that the quality of overall management was deteriorating and that the university was becoming more commercial and driven by a "user-pays" mentality inappropriate to the ethos of universities.

6 - STRESSES AND PRESSURES

In order to develop a clearer picture of the levels of work stress and the pressure points in the university environment, respondents were asked a variety of questions about their level of job stress and the factors that contributed to any job stress they felt.

Current Stress Levels

In total, 40% of all respondents found their job often or almost always stressful. By occupational group, the figures were 48% of academics, 44% of academic support staff, 37% of administrative support staff, 34% of technical staff, and 26% of librarians. The AUT study of British university staff (1990) reported an overall figure of 49%. The authors of the AUT study also found that academic teaching, administrative, and computer staff felt more frequent stress than research, library, or other related staff. In a study closer to home, Sharpley (1994) found only 25% of staff at Monash University in Australia had problems with job stress (though this study used different measures).

Academics reported significantly more job stress (chisq = 28.58, p < .001, df = 1) than the other groups, and librarians (chisq = 19.78, p < .001, df = 1) and technicians (chisq = 8.61, p < .01, df = 1) significantly less job stress. There were no overall differences by gender but there were by occupational group. Academic females were more likely to find their work stressful compared with academic males (chisq = 13.05, p < .001, df = 1). Male general staff were also more likely to find their work stressful compared with females (chisq = 4.16, p < .05, df = 1). Table 27 shows the figures for current work stress for each AUS occupational group.

Table 27

Current Work Stress

Stress Level	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Almost never stressful	3	1	10	8	13
Sometimes stressful	49	56	54	65	56
Often stressful	39	29	23	22	26
Almost always stressful	9	15	14	4	6

The reported stress levels of academic and general staff at each university were compared to see whether stress levels varied by university and between the 2 groups. Table 28 presents the results of this comparison.

Table 28
Stress Levels by University

Job stress experienced	Academic Staff N = 547 %	General Staff N = 624 %	Total N = 1171 %
Almost never or sometimes			
Auckland	49	62	58
Waikato	51	60	56
Massey	53	75	63
Victoria	52	74	62
Canterbury	65	71	68
Lincoln	47	60	53
Otago	43	66	57
Often or almost always			
Auckland	50	37	42
Waikato	49	38	44
Massey	47	24	37
Victoria	48	26	38
Canterbury	35	30	32
Lincoln	53	40	47
Otago	54	33	43

Academics reported significantly more work stress than general staff at Auckland (chisq = 5.31, $p < .05$, df = 1), Massey (chisq = 8.83, $p < .01$, df = 1), Victoria (chisq = 5.60, $p < .05$, df = 1), and Otago (chisq = 10.12, $p < .05$, df = 1). Respondents from Canterbury reported significantly less work stress than those from other universities (chisq = 4.77, $p < .05$, df = 1). This difference was mainly due to differences between the reported stress levels of academics, i.e., academics at Canterbury reported significantly less work stress than other academics (chisq = 5.48, $p < .05$, df = 1). There were no significant differences between universities for general staff.

Recent Changes to Stress Levels

To gauge whether the changes to universities described previously had affected their stress level, respondents were asked whether their level of work stress had changed. The majority (73%) of respondents stated that their jobs had become more stressful. This figure is similar to the 77% reported by the AUT U.K. study (1990). Academics were more likely to say that their stress levels had increased recently compared with the other groups (chisq = 22.38, $p < .001$, df = 1). Table 29 shows changes to stress levels reported by occupational group.

Table 29

Recent Changes to Stress Levels

Recent change	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Much more or more stressful	80	67	69	65	69
About the same	14	12	20	18	26
Less or much less stressful	3	2	6	8	3
New to job	3	6	5	6	3

Differences between occupational groups working at the same university were significant only for Waikato, where academics reported a higher increase in stress levels than their general staff colleagues (chisq = 5.56, p < .05, df = 1). All occupational groups at Lincoln were more likely to report a recent increase in stress levels compared with respondents in other universities (chisq = 4.17, p < .05, df = 1).

Table 30

Recent Changes to Stress Levels by University

More or much more stressful	Academic Staff N = 551 %	General Staff N = 628 %	Total N = 1179 %
Auckland	79	70	74
Waikato	82	57	70
Massey	72	66	70
Victoria	82	67	76
Canterbury	79	65	71
Lincoln	89	80	85
Otago	79	70	74

Expected Changes to Stress Levels in the Future

Respondents were asked if they expected their job to become more or less stressful in future. Table 31 reports respondents' views on this question. In total, 51% thought that their job was likely to become more stressful and 40% thought that their job stress would stay about the same. The figure from the 1990 AUT sample was 62% for increased job stress in the future.

Table 31
Expected Stress Levels in Future

Expected future stress level	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Much more or more stressful	54	56	50	45	46
About the same	37	29	40	44	48
Less or much less stressful	8	10	7	7	3

Stress Ratings

Respondents were asked to rate a series of work-related factors on a 6-point scale in terms of whether the factors were a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

Factors that were rated often or always stressful by 25% or more members of each occupational group are included in Table 32, along with the mean rating for each factor (calculated from the number of respondents who rated the factor from 1 to 5). The 3 sources of stress that received the highest percentage ratings are highlighted for each group. (A table of the factors mentioned by less than 25% of respondents is located in Appendix A.)

Most general staff rated work-related factors, such as their overall workload, deadlines, and interruptions to work, more highly as a source of stress than the actual content of their work, such as customer service or providing support for staff. Only 2 content-related factors were rated as being often or always a source of stress by more than 25% of general staff respondents: computer services and/or technical development by academic support staff, and customer service to students by library staff. It therefore appears that most stress or pressure in the university environment for general staff is caused by the volume of work and the way work is organised, rather than the actual work content. Factors such as a lack of career prospects and promotion also contribute to this stress.

Administrative staff were more likely than others to rate clarity of work role and quality of workspace as a frequent source of stress, library staff more likely than others to rate equipment and level of funding, and academic staff, the level and method of research funding.

At least a quarter of academic staff rated the work-content factors of course preparation and marking, research and publishing, undergraduate teaching, and administration as frequent sources of stress, along with a variety of work-related factors. Therefore for academic staff it appears that both work content and work organisation can cause stress.

The overall number of students and other aspects of work that involve teaching or servicing undergraduate students tended to be rated as stressful across all occupational groups, but relationships with students were not.

Table 32

Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 25% or More of Respondents

Work-related factors	Academic % Mean	Academic support % Mean	Admin. support % Mean	Library % Mean	Technical % Mean
Overall level of workload	**55 (3.57)**	**43 (3.42)**	**45 (3.41)**	**40 (3.31)**	**36 (3.15)**
Deadlines/demands	**50 (3.43)**	**48 (3.39)**	**51 (3.41)**	28 (2.95)	**40 (3.19)**
Interruptions to work	**48 (3.40)**	**57 (3.56)**	**46 (3.31)**	39 (3.16)	**42 (3.18)**
Staffing levels for area	35 (3.07)	41 (3.24)	31 (3.03)	**40 (3.24)**	p
University climate/morale	34 (3.03)	37 (3.09)	29 (3.00)	28 (2.90)	27 (2.82)
Support staff time	34 (2.99)	30 (2.92)	30 (2.86)	37 (2.99)	p
Level of research funding	34 (2.99)	*	*	*	*
Method of research funding	33 (2.86)	*	*	*	*
Lack of recognition for work	32 (2.85)	29 (2.95)	39 (3.27)	33 (3.03)	29 (2.82)
Student numbers/class sizes	30 (2.88)	35 (2.72)	41 (3.26)	30 (3.00)	25 (2.76)
Relief staff time	29 (2.67)	30 (2.87)	42 (3.09)	**43 (3.12)**	28 (2.65)
University management	28 (2.95)	p	26 (2.87)	p	29 (2.73)
Irregularity of workload	25 (2.72)	26 (2.67)	26 (2.71)	27 (2.77)	26 (2.77)
Lack of promotion/career prospects	p	28 (2.61)	34 (3.09)	36 (2.97)	32 (2.92)
Lack of feedback about work	p	p	32 (2.88)	28 (2.82)	25 (2.69)
Equipment	p	p	p	30 (2.86)	p
Level of funding for area	*	p	27 (2.66)	26 (2.80)	p
Office/work space	p	p	27 (2.56)	p	p
Clarity of job position/roles	p	p	26 (2.67)	p	p
Work content factors					
Course planning/marking	41 (3.21)	*	*	*	*
Research/writing/publishing	35 (3.08)	*	*	*	p
Internal administration/meetings	33 (3.07)	p	p	p	p
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	25 (2.94)	*	*	*	*
Technical/computing services	*	31 (2.91)	*	*	*
Customer service (student)	*	*	*	25(2.94)	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
p denotes factors that were rated as stressful by less than 25% of this occupational group.

Table 33 shows the factors that were rated least likely to cause stress. The 3 factors that received the lowest percentage rating are highlighted. On the whole, respondents tended to rate factors related to their work with people outside the university as least stressful. This may simply reflect the focus of many university workloads. Relationships with students, supervisors, and those supervised also received low ratings compared with other work content and work-related factors.

Table 33

Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 10% or Less of Respondents

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
Work-related factors	% Mean	% Mean	% Mean	% Mean	% Mean
Relations with colleagues	10 (2.33)	6 (2.21)	**5 (1.97)**	6 (2.16)	7 (1.99)
Lack of job autonomy/freedom	9 (1.90)	10 (1.99)	q	q	9 (1.90)
Performance appraisals of work	8 (2.16)	**6 (1.75)**	q	5 (2.02)	5 (1.83)
Relations with supervisors	8 (2.06)	q	q	q	q
Relations with outside clients	**3 (1.90)**	**3 (1.72)**	**1 (1.86)**	**3 (1.95)**	**3 (1.73)**
Relations with students	**2 (1.97)**	**3 (1.87)**	10 (2.03)	6 (2.03)	**1 (1.67)**
Relations with those supervised	**2 (1.97)**	9 (2.21)	q	**3 (2.07)**	**4 (1.99)**
Department/section organisation	q	q	q	10 (2.32)	q
Personal motivation	q	9 (2.29)	7 (2.13)	q	7 (2.06)
Lack of job security	q	8 (1.78)	q	**4 (1.61)**	q
Work-content factors					
Professional development/reading	q	q	9 (2.03)	q	10 (2.10)
Internal administration/meetings	q	q	10 (2.26)	q	q
Research/writing/publishing	q	*	*	*	9 (2.19)
Information/services for outside clients	*	8 (2.31)	**5 (2.09)**	*	*
Consultation/professional services	q	*	*	*	8 (2.33)
Assisting with induction and training	*	*	6 (2.15)	*	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
q denotes factors that were rated as stressful by more than 10% of an occupational group.

Sources of Stress

As well as rating a predetermined list of stress factors, respondents who found their job stressful were also asked to describe the 3 areas that caused them the most stress in their work. This question was answered by 95% of academics, 94% of academic support staff, 88% of librarians, 87% of technicians, and 84% of administrative support staff. Table 34 presents the categories mentioned by more than 10% of an occupational group. The 3 factors mentioned most often by respondents from each occupational group are highlighted.

Stresses mentioned by 10% or fewer of those responding included: extra or new responsibilities, change (past and present), lack of funding, lack of pay increases, lack of promotion or job security, lack of job satisfaction, other staff members' stress, equity issues for staff (general staff, women, ethnic minorities), seasonal peaks in work (by librarians), and increases in staff or staff requests (by general staff). Factors specific to academics mentioned by 10% or fewer included: declining teaching standards, lack of funding for research, and the pressure to publish for promotion.

Stress factors mentioned by respondents in this open-ended question are similar to those found by Sharpley (1994). Table 34 shows staff relationships and conflicts coming to the fore as common sources of stress in contrast to the stress factors rating scale on which these issues did not rate highly. This may be due to the fact that the stress rating scale covered wider university issues such as funding as well as likely day-to-day problems. When asked to describe their sources of stress, most respondents tended to concentrate more on the day-to-day issues.

Table 34
Stresses Mentioned by More than 10% of Respondents

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 525	N = 77	N = 92	N = 161	N = 219
Stresses common to all groups	%	%	%	%	%
Workload/lack of time/overload	**28**	**44**	**42**	**50**	**37**
Staff relations/communications	**25**	14	21	**24**	**26**
Deadlines	**22**	19	**36**	14	**26**
Increase in student numbers/requests	**22**	r	r	14	r
Conflicting demands/interruptions	21	**26**	**23**	**18**	25
Administration requirements	19	12	r	r	r
University management/leadership	16	**26**	17	13	16
Lack of recognition/support from managers/supervisors	12	r	13	12	16
Lack of support staff	r	r	16	14	r
Problems with buildings/work space	r	r	r	11	r
Stresses common to some groups					
Lack of time for reading/research	21	12	*	*	*
Volume of marking/course administration	15	*	*	*	*
Client contact role	*	16	16	16	r
Problems with equipment/computers	*	r	11	14	11
Lack of resources/equipment	*	r	r	r	12
Lack of training	*	r	r	11	r
Other	19	14	14	14	r

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes factors that were mentioned as stressful by 10% or less of an occupational group.

The following are a selection of typical comments by respondents on their 3 most common stressful work experiences:

Academic	*Difficult colleagues (and incompetent ones).* *Lack of personal and academic support for my career development as an academic.* *Gender inequalities [leading to] difficulties in combining parenting and academic work, personnel policies which are unsupportive.*
Academic support	*Prioritising job demands, especially at peak times.* *Dealing with difficult clients.* *Lack of communication/amount of control from employer.*
Administrative support	*Difficult work colleagues.* *Increased student/public inquiries.* *No solid support in secretarial area to offset balance of workload.*

Library	*Increasing volumes of work.* *Computers - new system applications.* *Difficult staff or clients.*
Technical	*Unable to meet people's (other staff and students) needs with the resources available.* *Performing tasks (e.g., budgeting) without adequate training and not receiving any feedback - reassurance or criticism, no recognition for the completed task.* *Undertaking additional responsibilities without receiving encouragement, acknowledgment, or remuneration.*

Stress Profile

Respondents who found their work often or almost always stressful were compared with those who found their work only sometimes or almost never stressful to see if they differed in their responses to other questions. Statistically significant trends (at $p = .05$ or less) are reported below.

Academic Staff

Academics who found their job stressful were also likely to: be aged between 20 to 40; be female; have been in their job for 1-8 years; be at the level of lecturer; have experienced workload increases and expect their workload to increase in the future; think that the quality of their teaching, research, their area organisation, university management, and the overall quality of their working life had deteriorated; be dissatisfied with their job; and think that their salary did not reflect their work.

Academic Support Staff

Academic support staff who found their work stressful were likely to: think that the quality of the services they provided and the overall quality of their working life had deteriorated; and think that their salary did not reflect the work that they do.

Administrative Support Staff

Administrative staff who found their job stressful were also likely to: have experienced workload increases; think that the quality of the services they provided, their area organisation, and the overall quality of their working life had deteriorated; and think that their salary did not reflect their work.

Library Staff

The librarians who found their work to be stressful were also likely to: have experienced workload increases and expect their workload to increase in the future; to think that the quality of the services they provided and the overall quality of their working life had deteriorated; and to be dissatisfied with their job.

Technical Staff

Technicians who found their job stressful were also likely to: be males, be managers/directors; be located in a general service area rather than in a department; have experienced workload increases; think that the quality of the services they provided, their area organisation, university management, and the overall quality of their working life had deteriorated; be dissatisfied with their job; and think that their salary did not reflect their work.

Sharpley, in his 1994 study of staff at Monash University in Australia, found that those in the 31-40 age group and women experienced more job stress. He found very few differences for full- and part-time, temporary and permanent staff. This is very similar to the patterns found here for academic staff and to a lesser extent for other groups. There were no significant differences across occupational groups for full- or part-time status or salary range.

Relationship Between Workload and Stress

Those reporting increases to their workload were also more likely than others to report work stress (academics (chisq = 15.64, p < .001, df = 1), technicians (chisq = 8.00, p < .01, df = 1), administrative support staff (chisq = 4.10, p < .05, df = 1), and librarians (chisq = 4.01, p = .05, df = 1)). This trend was also evident for academic support staff but the numbers in each group were too small to draw conclusions.

Similar trends appeared in comparing universities but the numbers were not significant. Respondents from the 2 universities with the least work stress (Canterbury and Massey) had the lowest numbers reporting workload increases. Respondents from the university with the largest numbers reporting work stress and recent increases to work stress (Lincoln) also had the largest numbers reporting increases to workload.

The reasons given by respondents at these 2 universities for their sources of stress and increased workload show some differences. Academics at Lincoln were more likely to mention deadlines as stresses in their work (chisq = 9.19, p < .01, df = 1), and were twice as likely to mention leadership and university management as an issue that concerned them (*see* page 55), compared with respondents from other universities (chisq = 10.89, p < .01, df = 1). Other differing patterns of responses between academics at Lincoln and Canterbury were visible but, due to the fact that Lincoln had the lowest numbers of academics, not all trends were statistically significant.

Lincoln staff were more likely than others to note increases in their administrative work and new responsibilities. Lincoln had the highest proportion of academics reporting deterioration to the quality of their working life as a whole, and overload and lack of job satisfaction as 1 of the 3 things that caused them the most stress.

Academics at Canterbury were least likely to mention increases in course and lecture preparation, and were the second-to-smallest group to mention new responsibilities and increases in research output. They also mentioned lack of job satisfaction, decreasing teaching standards, and lack of recognition and support from management least often when compared with academics from other universities.

In terms of impacts caused by changes to university structure and management, Lincoln academics mentioned a lack of communication and the commercialisation of the university more often than respondents from other universities. In contrast, Canterbury academics mentioned these issues least often.

An analysis of the stress factor scale showed that Lincoln academics rated lack of feedback about work, performance appraisals and student appraisals, relations with supervisors, and overall university management as more stressful than their academic colleagues at other universities though none of these differences were statistically significant. In contrast to this, academics from Canterbury did not rate any of the 39 categories more highly than academics from other universities. Canterbury academics were less likely to rate the following factors as stressful compared to their colleagues at other universities: university management (chisq = 11.22, p < .001, df = 1), university climate and morale (chisq = 9.90, p < .01, df = 1), lack of recognition for work (chisq = 3.95, p = .05, df = 1), deadlines and demands (chisq = 7.08, p < .01, df = 1), lack of job security (chisq = 5.29, p < .05, df = 1), lack of autonomy (chisq = 3.84, p < .01, df = 1), and method of teaching funding (chisq = 3.83, p = .05, df = 1).

Other statistically significant differences by university for academic staff were:

- Auckland: more likely to find lack of promotion and career prospects stressful (chisq = 4.77, $p < .05$, df = 1) and less likely to find course and study guide planning stressful (chisq = 4.30, $p < .05$, df = 1);

- Waikato: more likely to find internal administration and meetings stressful (chisq = 5.97, $p < .05$, df = 1).

- Massey: more likely to find department and section organisation stressful (chisq = 4.31, $p < .05$, df = 1) and less likely to find student numbers and class sizes stressful (chisq = 14.07, $p < .001$, df = 1); and

- Otago: more likely to find university climate and morale (chisq = 9.50, $p < .01$, df = 1), research, writing, and publishing (chisq = 5.63, $p < .05$, df = 1), lack of promotion and career prospects (chisq = 4.77, $p < .05$, df = 1), and level of research funding (chisq = 5.72, $p < .05$, df = 1) stressful.

There appears to be some evidence that Lincoln academics are less content with their working life and the management of their university than the other groups of academics, and this, combined with workload increases, is causing some discontent. There also appears to be some evidence that Canterbury academics are experiencing less stress and are more content with their working life compared with other groups of academics.

Though workload increases account for some of the stress experienced by university staff it appears that other factors that cause stress vary across universities.

Relationship Between Gender and Stress for Academic Staff

Female academics have been identified from the data in this survey and from overseas research as a group who experience more stress than their male counterparts. Further analysis of the survey data was undertaken in order that any differences between male and female academics might be studied in more depth.

Female academics were significantly more likely to be younger (chisq = 17.13, $p < .01$, df = 4), and of a lower rank than their male counterparts (chisq = 61.65, $p < .001$, df = 4); they were also underrepresented compared with the total New Zealand population: only 23% of academics responding to the survey were female.

Full-time male and female academics reported working approximately the same number of hours per week but females reported spending a significantly higher proportion of their time teaching (chisq = 22.87, $p < .01$, df = 9), (median female category: 51-60% of time, median male category: 41-50% of time). On average, full-time female academics reported spending slightly more hours on undergraduate teaching and fewer hours on postgraduate teaching than males, though these differences were not significant.

Responses to the rating scale for stress factors were separated into 2 groups: those who ranked an item as often or always stressful and those who ranked it as never, rarely, or sometimes stressful. Females and males in these 2 groups were then compared. No factors were ranked by males as significantly more stressful. Female academics rated 10 of the 39 items as often or always stressful more frequently than males:

- lack of job security (chisq = 11.17, $p < .001$, df = 1);
- clarity of job position and roles (chisq = 13.66, $p < .001$, df = 1);
- research, writing, and publishing (chisq = 17.03, $p < .001$, df = 1);
- department and section organisation (chisq = 10.31, $p < .01$, df = 1);
- overall level of workload (chisq = 5.62, $p < .05$, df = 1);
- undergraduate contact teaching (chisq = 5.25, $p < .05$, df = 1);
- student numbers and class sizes (chisq = 4.15, $p < .05$, df = 1);
- support staff time available (chisq = 5.81, $p < .05$, df = 1);
- availability of relieving staff (chisq = 6.37, $p < .05$, df = 1); and
- relations with supervisors (chisq = 5.92, $p < .05$, df = 1).

Responses to the question on the 3 most common work stresses were also analysed for patterns. Female academics mentioned staff relations and communications problems more often than males (chisq = 6.20, df = 1, $p < .05$). Females also mentioned "issues as a member of a minority group" significantly more often than males, but as the number of respondents (both male and female) who commented on this issue was so small it is difficult to draw any conclusions from this information.

Research, writing, and publishing may appear more significant as a stress factor than contact teaching because of the greater proportion of time women academics give to teaching, leaving little time for research. Vasil (1993) suggested that female academics spent more time in teaching-related activities than males, thus affecting their share in the allocation of "rewards" such as promotion. It also seems that within departments or faculties staff relationships and hierarchies are more of a problem for women. Vasil reports that males are over-represented in academic senior ranks. Data from this survey shows that women academics are more likely than their male colleagues to feel that they have less access to support for their work in terms of support staff and relieving staff.

Overseas research has shown that younger academics are more likely to feel stressed in comparison to their more established counterparts. Therefore the differences reported here between males and females are likely to be due not only to gender differences, but also to differences in age, experience, and rank.

Current Job Satisfaction

Despite increasing workloads and stress, the majority of respondents (65%) indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs as shown by Table 35. There were no differences between occupational groups in the levels of job satisfaction reported.

Table 35

Current Levels of Job Satisfaction

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Job satisfaction	%	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied or satisfied	65	66	58	69	66
Neutral	14	16	26	13	17
Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	19	14	18	17	16
Not sure	2	1	3	2	-

In interpreting the seeming disparity between increasing stress and job satisfaction, a variety of factors need to be taken into account. The main sources of work-related stress for many university staff were linked to the organisation of their work and workload, rather than the actual content of their job. For some people an increase in stress can equate to an increase in challenge and therefore, more job satisfaction.

Recent Changes to Job Satisfaction

When asked if their levels of job satisfaction had changed, 37% overall stated their job had become less satisfying, 29% more satisfying, and 27% about the same.

Table 36

Recent Changes to Levels of Job Satisfaction

Recent change to job satisfaction	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Much more or more satisfied	24	28	26	41	31
About the same	26	34	30	21	31
Less or much less satisfied	44	30	35	25	33
New to job	3	7	5	8	2
Not sure	2	1	4	2	2

Academics were more likely to report that their level of job satisfaction had decreased (chisq = 22.23, $p < .001$, df = 2) and librarians were more likely to say that their level of job satisfaction had increased (chisq = 28.70, $p < .001$, df = 2) when compared to the other university occupational groups.

As an indicator of whether they were content in their work and their general job prospects, respondents were asked whether they thought they would be in university employment in 5 years' time. Academics were more likely to think that they would be (chisq = 30.94, $p < .001$, df = 1).

Table 37

Likelihood of Being in University Employment in 1999

Likelihood of staying in university	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Likely to be in university employment	59	40	34	39	32
Not likely to be in university employment	15	22	25	23	21
Not sure	27	39	44	35	46

Summary

Work stress was often experienced by 40% of all respondents. The majority of respondents thought their work stress had increased recently and that it was likely to increase in the future. The majority were also satisfied with their work, but 37% thought that their work had recently become less satisfying. Those who had experienced an increase in workload were also more likely to experience work stress.

Over all, the level of work stress and the potential for this level to increase appears to be an issue for all respondents no matter which university or occupational group they are located in. However, Canterbury respondents were less likely than those at other universities to report work stress, and Lincoln respondents more likely to note recent increases in work stress.

Academic staff appear to be more stressed and to have experienced more decreases in job satisfaction than respondents from the other groups. Female academics were more stressed than their male counterparts. Library staff appear less stressed than others, and have experienced more recent increases to job satisfaction.

Causes of university job stress were found to be: the overall level of workload, deadlines and demands, interruptions to work, staffing issues, university management and climate, funding issues, dissatisfaction with salary, student numbers, problems with the lack of funding and lack of support staff, lack of promotion and career prospects, lack of recognition and feedback for work, and staff communications and conflicts. These factors are similar to those mentioned in overseas literature, indicating that the international university community is grappling with the same issues.

General staff were more concerned about lack of promotion, career prospects and feedback about work, and academic staff more concerned about their work content in terms of internal administration, course planning, undergraduate teaching, and research. Librarians tended to show a different stress pattern from the other occupational groups. Two of the 3 most highly rated stress factors for them involved staffing levels in their area.

7 - IMPROVEMENTS AND ISSUES

Work Improvements

Respondents were asked to suggest 3 changes that would make their work more worthwhile; 92% of academics, 90% of academic support staff, 86% each of administrative support staff and technicians, and 85% of librarians gave suggestions. An analysis of the areas mentioned by more than 10% of the members of each occupational group who responded to the question is presented in Table 38. The 3 areas that were mentioned most frequently by each occupational group are highlighted.

Table 38

Changes That Would Make Work More Worthwhile
Listed by More than 10% of Respondents

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 510	N = 74	N = 95	N = 159	N = 215
Improvements (all groups)	%	%	%	%	%
Better management/decision making	**26**	**36**	r	12	**22**
Better personnel management	18	14	r	r	r
Less time on university administration	16	r	r	r	r
More support staff	14	**41**	**35**	**30**	**19**
More recognition from managers	13	16	24	16	**19**
Better promotion system/job security	11	16	r	14	12
Salary increase	r	20	**45**	**34**	**27**
Better buildings/work spaces	r	20	**27**	18	16
Less workload/more time	r	**22**	12	11	12
Better equipment/resources	r	r	11	16	**19**
More communication/teamwork	r	r	r	r	15
Improvements (some groups)					
More time spent on research/publishing	**34**	*	*	*	11
More funding for teaching/tutoring	**22**	*	*	*	*
More funding for research	20	*	*	*	*
Fewer students/smaller classes	14	*	*	*	*
Less student time/demands	12	*	*	*	*
More funding/better funding system	r	15	r	r	r
More job autonomy/challenge	*	18	14	**25**	13
More job/staff training	*	15	13	18	18
More time for professional development	*	16	r	r	r
More time spent on planning	*	12	*	*	*
Other changes	17	r	r	13	11

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes changes that were mentioned by 10% or less of an occupational group.

Other suggestions made by 10% or fewer of general staff respondents included: fewer deadlines, fewer interruptions, more recognition from colleagues and clients, clearer job roles and descriptions, more time to consult with staff and, for librarians, changes in some library functions. Six percent of administrative staff and 1% of librarians stated that they enjoyed their job and saw no need for improvements. Areas mentioned by 10% or fewer academics were: less time on course and research administration, more time for teaching, more ability to specialise in areas of interest, more time with undergraduate and postgraduate students, improving the quality and attitudes of students, more funding for students, and better course and curriculum organisation.

As shown by Table 38 general staff and academics gave different suggestions for making their jobs more worthwhile. Increases in salaries was the change most frequently mentioned by librarians, administrative support, and technical staff. For academic support staff it was an increase in, or funding for, support staff, and for academics having more time to spend on research, writing, and publishing was the major change that would make their job more worthwhile. The following are typical examples of the 3 changes suggested by a member of each occupational group:

Academic	*More democratic and co-operative team atmosphere.* *More time and space to do creative research, thinking, reading, and writing which would enrich teaching.* *To be allowed to specialise in my field and in postgraduate supervision and teaching.*
Academic support	*Better pay.* *Better funding.* *Better resourcing.*
Administrative support	*More support from superiors.* *Better training.* *Salary increase.*
Library	*Pay rise.* *More responsibility and challenge.* *Opportunity for advancement.*
Technical	*Get a supervisor who knows how to do his [sic] job.* *Get additional support staff.* *Get a different office (not open-plan).*

Summary

Each occupational group had different priorities as to what would make their job more worthwhile, though similar issues were mentioned by all groups. Employing more support staff, which would reduce workloads, was a priority for 4 of the 5 groups. Better management was a change suggested often by 3 groups, and a salary increase was mentioned frequently by members of the 3 lowest paid groups. Academic staff would like more time to spend on research, and more funding for teaching and tutoring. Library staff would like more interesting work and more job challenge. Academic support staff would like their workload lessened, and technicians would like more equipment. Administrative support staff placed more priority on better work spaces than respondents from the other occupational groups.

Current Issues

Respondents were asked to describe the 3 main issues that currently concerned them within the university environment; 90% of academic support staff, 87% of academics, 86% of technicians, 81% of administrative support staff, and 78% of librarians responded to this question. Table 39 gives figures for issues mentioned by more than 10% of respondents from any one occupational group who responded to the question. The 3 issues most frequently mentioned by members of each occupational group are highlighted.

Table 39

Current Issues Mentioned by More than 10% of Respondents

Issues common to all groups	Academic N = 481 %	Academic support N = 74 %	Admin. support N = 89 %	Library N = 149 %	Technical N = 198 %
Management/leadership	**41**	**36**	**29**	**27**	**27**
Impact of government policies on education	**26**	**27**	11	r	12
Funding for students/student fees	**21**	**28**	r	**28**	13
Changes/future changes	**21**	20	r	26	18
Funding (general)	20	**27**	11	**36**	**31**
Staff relations/communications/politics	15	r	r	r	r
Promotion/job security	14	r	15	r	17
Salaries	r	12	**43**	20	**22**
Student numbers/teaching ratios	r	r	12	20	r
Staff morale	r	r	**20**	r	r
Equity for general staff	r	19	19	16	12
Funding for staffing	r	14	13	15	r
Buildings/work space/crowding	r	r	16	r	11
Issues common to some groups					
Funding for research/area of interest	11	*	*	*	*
General staff negotiations/contract	*	r	17	21	20
Other issues	14	18	r	13	r

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
r denotes issues that were mentioned by 10% or less of an occupational group.

Issues mentioned here by 10% or fewer included: decreasing standards of teaching, research, and overall work; recognition from management or supervisors; levels of workload; unclear policies; job roles and autonomy; funding for resources and equipment; equity issues for staff (women, ethnic minorities); and equity for minority-group students. Ten percent or fewer of technicians mentioned health and safety regulations and training; and 10% or fewer of academics mentioned funding for teaching, the quality of students, academic freedom, and autonomy.

Typical examples of the 3 issues described follow:

Academic	*Deterioration in culture of the university, e.g., staff-student and staff-management relations.* *Staff overwork (re administration).* *Students missing out on the joy of learning in a liberal environment and suffering financial duress.*
Academic support	*The lack of planning or valuing (apart from buildings) for people (human resources).* *The lack of development in management skills for HOD/HOS.* *The perception that general staff are "invisible", don't really exist. When I ask for a definition of "staff" the answer invariably is "academics" quite literally. So staff meetings in departments generally only mean academic staff!*
Administrative support	*Lack of appreciation (including salary rises) from the management.* *Proposals for immense changes in the university system such as the introduction of semesters.* *The rigid hierarchical structure which concentrates authority at the top and power in the people at the top level.*
Library	*University attitude towards students. The "user pays" philosophy is very divisive.* *University attitude towards staff especially general staff. Contract negotiations are proving very divisive.* *Government attitude towards universities and education.*
Technical	*Employment contract - still being negotiated.* *Cost recovery within the university - high charge for labour.* *Increase in student numbers but not facilities.*

Issues for Academic Staff

Because of the larger number of respondents in the academic occupational group it was possible to do an analysis of the primary issues for academics from each university. The following summary provides information on the issues that were mentioned with the greatest frequency by respondents from each university.

Auckland

Buildings, space, and overcrowding were mentioned with the greatest frequency by Auckland academics.

Waikato

Waikato academics mentioned lack of recognition and support from management, staff relations, unclear policies, and the impact of government policy on education more often than all other groups of academics.

Massey

Massey academics mentioned changes and future changes more often than all other groups of academics (except Lincoln). (Massey academics also commented on the extra workload from extramural courses in various sections of the questionnaire.)

Victoria

Victoria academics mentioned overall level of workload and funding for students more often than all other groups of academics.

Canterbury

Equity issues for women staff were mentioned the most by Canterbury academics.

Lincoln

Lincoln academics mentioned leadership, funding in general and for research, changes and future changes, teaching ratios and standards, the quality of students, increasing student numbers, and academic freedom more often as issues than all other groups of academics.

Otago

Salary and promotion were issues that were mentioned the most frequently by Otago academics.

Equity

Between 12% and 19% of respondents from each general staff group commented on equity issues for general staff in the issues section of this survey. Other staff members from minority groups also commented on equity for their particular group. Of the 125 female staff who responded to the questions on the 3 most stressful job factors and university issues, 15 commented on equity issues for women, and 3 of the 13 Maori and Pacific Island respondents did the same for equity issues for staff from minority ethnic groups. Comments on equity issues tended to be scattered throughout the questionnaire. Because of the small number of respondents in some minority groups, it is not possible statistically to analyse these comments but the issues that they raise are worthy of interest, for example:

From changes to work suggested:

Academic support	*More recognition of support staff as professionals in their own right, with more equitable leave, conditions of employment etc.*

From 3 current university issues concerning staff:

Academic	*Lack of representation across the university of Maori staff and students who are clustered in departments which cater for them appropriately.* *Status of women staff - (located generally in junior lecturing positions - high teaching, no time for research).* *Imbalance of women and minorities on the staff change is* ***SLOW*** *and wills are weak.*
Technical	*Poor relationship between general/academic staff.*

From reasons for changes to workload:

Academic

Students get to know you as an "established" but still "young" and female member of staff - so you are sought out for advice. I feel especially the need to push myself to **ever** *be promoted from lecturer to senior lecturer. As a woman I get sought out for committees which is another stress.*

From impacts of workload changes:

Academic

Own research, particularly PhD work, has suffered greatly. This is similar situation for all staff who have yet to complete PhDs, particularly Maori staff who are having to develop programmes and supervise/mentor Maori/Pacific Island students (as well as other students).

From the 3 most stressful things about work:

Academic

Ever widening number of areas I am expected to teach, partly because of staff sabbaticals, partly generally short-staffed, partly only Maori input.

Summary

The primary issues for most respondents appear to be university management and leadership, funding, salaries, research, and teaching time. General staff were concerned about their employment contract negotiations, and equity with academic staff in terms of salary and recognition.

Many of the issues mentioned by general staff such as dissatisfaction with salary and equity with academic staff are similar to issues reported by Strachan and Duirs (1993).

Academic staff expressed a range of concerns to do with teaching and research mostly in relation to funding, the amount of time available, and student numbers. Concerned was also expressed about wider educational issues such as the impact of government policies on education and changes to the university system such as semesterisation and the development of new campuses such as Albany and Tamaki. These concerns are similar to the issues mentioned by Russell's (1992) survey of university managers, though the respondents to this survey focus more on management issues and less on public accountability a difference which might be accounted for by the fact that Russell's survey was of staff with management responsibilities.

8 - OVERVIEW: RESULTS AND ISSUES

The results of this survey suggest that the overall quality of working life is declining for many university staff. Many of those surveyed were finding their work often or always stressful; the majority stated that their work had become more stressful recently, and that they saw this trend continuing in the future.

One of the major factors involved in the increase in stress levels was increases in workload. The majority of respondents stated that their workload had increased recently, and was likely to increase in the future. And although the majority found their work satisfying, many respondents noted a decrease rather than an increase in work satisfaction in recent years. Other stress factors often mentioned included deadlines and demands, interruptions to work, staffing levels, management, and staff relations.

The major reason given by respondents for workload changes was increases to the numbers of students in universities. As reported in the literature review there is an international trend for increasing student numbers, deteriorating staff:student ratios and decreasing government support via funding. The effects of these changes on staff or students have yet to be assessed in any systematic way - for example, the literature appears to be silent on the effect of large classes on educational standards in universities, except to say that students in small classes get higher marks - even if they present the same work. This is not the case for other educational settings, namely, primary and secondary, where information is available on the effects of differing class sizes.

The results of this survey show other similarities with overseas studies, namely: number of hours worked per week by academics, proportion of time spent on major work areas by academics, factors that cause stress in university environments, and variable stress levels reported by different groupings of staff.

In this survey, and in the literature, female and recently appointed academics were identified as more likely to experience stress compared with academics. Other minority groups, such as general staff and staff from minority ethnic groups also experienced pressures.

Some differences between the New Zealand situation and overseas exist. In the United States a move from teaching to research is documented in the literature, and in the United Kingdom there is an increase in short-term research-based contract staff with no teaching responsibilities. New Zealand university staff appear to be spending more time on teaching and teaching-related activities. A major concern for New Zealand academics appears to be decreasing time for research, writing, publishing, and professional development.

It seems that either an over-emphasis on research (as in the U.S.) or teaching (as in N.Z.) may affect the quality of the education that students receive, as essentially the work that academics do is a blend of both these areas. Careful consideration is needed as to what the optimum balance is for all parties: students, staff, and management.

Other issues of concern to New Zealand respondents also feature in the overseas literature: the imbalance of academic promotion criteria that focus predominantly on research, and the lack of career paths for general staff.

University management comes to the fore as an important issue for respondents in various sections of this report. It seems that management systems are not keeping up with the fast pace of change within universities, and that the general management style, both overall and within departments, does not provide enough opportunities for communication, feedback, and staff development. The quality of university management appears to be one of the factors that influenced respondents' levels of stress.

It is likely that the trends reported here cannot continue indefinitely without having effects on the health and work satisfaction levels of university staff, or the quality of teaching, research, library, technical, and administrative services in New Zealand universities.

In summary there appear to be a variety of factors that are contributing to stress in the university environment which need to be addressed namely:

- workloads and work hours;
- staffing;
- work organisation in terms of seasonal peaks, interruptions, and balance between areas (e.g., teaching and research);
- increasing student numbers and deteriorating staff:student ratios;
- promotion criteria;
- salaries;
- university general and personnel management;
- inequities in the system for general staff, staff from ethnic minorities, and women staff; and
- university funding.

APPENDIX A

Details of Respondents and Additional Tables

Table 40
Sample Population

University	Academic N = 855	Academic support N = 115	Admin. support N = 154	Library N = 267	Technical N = 387	**Total** **N = 1778**
Auckland	187	19	102	67	100	**475**
Waikato	82	17	8	26	22	**155**
Massey	153	18	10	35	67	**283**
Victoria	118	13	7	33	27	**198**
Canterbury	111	19	14	38	59	**241**
Lincoln	44	9	3	13	20	**89**
Otago	160	20	10	55	92	**337**
Total	**855**	**115**	**154**	**267**	**387**	**1778**

Table 41
Return Rate by Occupational Group and University

University	Academic N = 552	Academic support N = 82	Admin. support N = 110	Library N = 184	Technical N = 253	**Total** **N = 1181**
Auckland	118	17	79	46	62	**322**
Waikato	49	9	3	17	18	**96**
Massey	104	13	5	21	41	**184**
Victoria	76	9	4	22	20	**131**
Canterbury	72	13	8	29	38	**160**
Lincoln	36	6	3	10	11	**66**
Otago	97	15	8	39	63	**222**
Total	**552**	**82**	**110**	**184**	**253**	**1181**

Table 42

Ethnicity of Respondents

Ethnicity	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Pakeha/European	93	95	88	90	95
Maori	3	2	4	2	2
Pacific Island	-	-	4	-	-
Asian	2	-	3	5	-
Other	2	2	3	1	2

The ethnicity of respondents is not representative of the N.Z. population aged 20-59 which, according to the 1991 census, includes 82% Pakeha/European, 10% Maori, 4% Pacific Island, 3% Asian, and 1% other or not specified (from *1991 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings*, (1992) Department of Statistics; figures do not include those with combinations of 2 or more ethnic groups). Nor is it representative of the ethnicity of university students. Data from *Education Statistics of New Zealand 1994* (Ministry of Education) report the 1993 figures for student ethnicity as 77% European, 8% Maori, 2% Pacific Island, 5% Asian, 3% overseas, and 5% other or not specified.

Table 43

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Female	23	41	81	80	41
Male	76	57	18	17	58

Of the total respondents 56% were male and 42% female; 2% did not specify their gender.

Table 44

Age of Respondents

Age	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Less than 20 years	-	-	1	-	-
21-30 years	2	16	11	20	15
31-40 years	20	27	16	26	31
41-50 years	**41**	**44**	**40**	**29**	**28**
51-60 years	33	12	30	21	23
More than 60 years	4	-	1	2	2

Note - the median category for each group is highlighted.

Table 45

Location Within University

Location	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Sciences	40	11	16	8	60
Humanities/Social Sciences	33	21	12	1	6
Commerce	13	2	5	7	1
Medicine/Health	11	2	12	9	19
Fine Arts/Music/Architecture	2	-	1	5	1
Central Library	*	*	*	69	*
Central Administration/Registry	*	6	47	*	*
Computer Centres	*	38	*	*	*
Student Services	*	20	*	*	*
Works and Services	*	*	5	*	11
Other	1	-	-	-	-

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 46

Representativeness by University

University	Return Number	Return %	Total Number	Total %
Auckland	322	27	1284	26
Waikato	96	8	414	9
Massey	184	16	784	16
Victoria	131	11	557	11
Canterbury	160	14	661	14
Lincoln	66	6	237	5
Otago	222	19	909	19
Total	**1181**	**101***	**4846**	**100**

Note - due to rounding this percentage does not total to 100.

Table 47

Representativeness by Gender

	Academic		Academic support		Admin. support		Library		Technical	
Gender	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %
Female	23	24	41	38	81	76	80	80	41	32
Male	76	76	57	62	18	24	17	20	58	68
Total	**99***	**100**	**98***	**100**	**99***	**100**	**97***	**100**	**99***	**100**

Note - these percentages do not total to 100 as some respondents did not specify their gender.

Academic staff ranks (as reported in *Education Statistics of New Zealand 1994*) were compared with those of the return sample to assess whether the sample chosen reflected the general population of academics in New Zealand. It was not possible to do the same for general staff as details by job rank were not provided by the Ministry of Education (MoE). Some of the MoE job categories were collapsed in order that comparisons might be made. The return sample contained significantly more higher ranking academics (chisq = 7.77, p = .05, df = 3).

Table 48

Representativeness by Academic Rank

University	Return No.	Return %	Total No.	Total %
Lecturer/Teaching Fellow/Tutor	150	27	853	30
Senior Lecturer	215	39	1181	42
Associate Professor/Professor/Dean	181	33	768	27
Other	2	-	15	1
Total	**548**	**99***	**2817**	**100**

Note - due to rounding this percentage does not total to 100.

Table 49

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases in Workload Areas

Area	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Course/lecture planning	65	*	*	*	*
Support/services to students	64	54	45	58	*
Administration/meetings	63	52	50	43	53
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	47	*	*	*	*
Postgraduate supervision	44	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	38	*	*	*	*
Research/writing/publishing	27	*	*	*	16
Consultation/professional services	14	*	*	*	34
Professional development	15	32	35	42	35
Other areas	12	20	42	20	24
Support/services to staff	*	62	57	42	*
Technical or computer services	*	50	*	*	*
Instruction/induction	*	39	11	25	*
Support/services to external clients	*	27	40	27	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	54	*
Word processing	*	*	44	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	31	*	*
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	47
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	43
General technical services	*	*	*	*	42
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	45

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 50

Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Workload Areas

Area	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	37	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	36	*	*	*	*
Professional development	36	32	29	31	29
Research/writing/publishing	32	*	*	*	12
Postgraduate supervision	30	*	*	*	*
Consultation/professional services	29	*	*	*	24
Support/services to students	28	21	16	15	*
Administration/meetings	26	40	25	36	25
Course/lecture planning	24	*	*	*	*
Support/services to external clients	*	44	30	31	*
Support services to staff	*	28	17	33	*
Technical or computer services	*	22	*	*	*
Instruction/induction	*	16	15	17	*
Word processing	*	*	26	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	11	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	26	*
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	33
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	30
General technical services	*	*	*	*	28
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	23
Other areas	15	23	14	17	16

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 51

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Decreases in Workload Areas

Area	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Professional development	36	26	4	5	6
Research/writing/publishing	35	*	*	*	6
Consultation/professional services	11	*	*	*	1
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	9	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	8	*	*	*	*
Administration/meetings	6	1	1	1	2
Postgraduate supervision	5	*	*	*	*
Course/lecture planning	4	*	*	*	*
Support/services to students	2	4	5	5	*
Technical or computer services	*	6	*	*	*
Instruction/induction	*	5	1	2	*
Support/services to external clients	*	2	1	2	*
Support/services to staff	*	1	-	2	*
Word processing	*	*	6	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	4	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	1	*	*
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	8
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	6
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	5
General technical services	*	*	*	*	3
Other areas	3	3	-	-	1

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 52

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement in Work Situation

Quality of	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Resources/equipment	49	65	57	75	54
Instruction/teaching	43	33	*	42	*
Admin./organisation in area	36	33	43	40	33
Research	32	*	*	*	*
Interactions with students	28	30	27	43	27
Work environment (space/light)	27	34	35	53	28
Student evaluations of teaching	27	*	*	*	*
Interactions with colleagues	19	41	41	42	38
Interactions with outside clients	19	18	26	20	22
Interactions with other uni. staff	18	32	43	36	34
Performance reviews/appraisals	15	26	15	34	22
Working life in general	14	21	25	32	25
Overall university management	12	13	14	17	11
Services provided	*	66	67	71	59
Other areas					
Career/promotion prospects	16	16	12	18	17
Level of funding for research	16	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for research	9	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	8	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for teaching	6	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	5	*	*	*	*
Ability to exercise academic freedom	4	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for area	*	30	14	29	14
Method of funding for area	*	12	5	7	8

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 53

Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Work Situation

Quality of	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
Work environment (space/light)	47	34	37	19	40
Student evaluations of teaching	47	*	*	*	*
Interactions with other uni. staff	44	39	45	40	45
Interactions with students	41	34	36	29	46
Interactions with colleagues	39	32	43	33	42
Performance reviews/appraisals	36	38	40	35	43
Interactions with outside clients	28	45	43	34	37
Instruction/teaching	28	15	*	10	*
Admin./organisation in area	27	20	25	26	32
Research	26	*	*	*	*
Resources/equipment	26	18	28	9	25
Overall university management	21	28	25	31	28
Working life in general	18	20	35	25	32
Services provided	*	7	16	11	19
Other areas					
Ability to exercise academic freedom	56	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for teaching	49	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	45	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	39	*	*	*	*
Career/promotion prospects	35	55	45	48	42
Method of funding for research	34	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for research	32	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for area	*	23	32	21	28
Method of funding for area	*	40	37	34	39

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 54

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Deterioration in Work Situation

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Quality of	%	%	%	%	%
Working life in general	60	51	34	32	40
Overall university management	47	38	36	25	38
Interactions with colleagues	36	26	10	18	17
Research	33	*	*	*	*
Interactions with other uni. staff	30	27	7	8	17
Admin./organisation in area	29	32	23	21	30
Interactions with students	26	13	8	12	14
Work environment (space/light)	24	24	25	23	34
Resources/equipment	22	13	17	15	24
Instruction/teaching	19	6	*	3	*
Interactions with outside clients	15	9	3	11	6
Performance reviews/appraisals	7	15	22	9	17
Student evaluations of teaching	7	*	*	*	*
Services provided	*	27	13	14	21
Other areas					
Level of funding for research	38	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for research	38	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	36	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	35	*	*	*	*
Career/promotion prospects	33	26	24	23	29
Ability to exercise academic freedom	27	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for teaching	18	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for area	*	22	16	16	23
Level of funding for area	*	34	27	26	42

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 55

Balance of Workload

Preference for use of time	Academic N = 552 %	Academic support N = 82 %	Admin. support N = 110 %	Library N = 184 %	Technical N = 253 %
More research	79	*	*	*	30
Less teaching	25	*	*	*	5
More teaching	10	*	*	*	10
Less research	-	*	*	*	2
More professional service	*	33	*	*	*
More technical service	*	17	*	*	*
Less professional service	*	4	*	*	*
Less technical service	*	2	*	*	*
More non-contact/general service	*	*	23	14	25
Less non-contact/general service	*	*	4	4	4
More customer contact	*	*	*	25	*
Less customer contact	*	*	*	6	*
Other/not sure	5	7	15	8	6

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 56

Impacts of Changes to University Structure and Management
Comments Made by 10% or Less of Those Responding to the Question

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 408	N = 57	N = 70	N = 100	N = 143
Impacts	%	%	%	%	%
Poor management/communication	q	q	4	q	q
Increased management authority	q	q	9	q	9
Commercialisation of university	q	q	7	5	q
Less emphasis on/funding for teaching	9	*	*	*	*
Improvements to management/policies	9	5	9	q	8
Increased workload	8	q	q	q	q
Decreasing work/education quality	8	-	-	1	4
Lack of recognition of staff	6	q	q	q	q
More pressure to increase EFTS	5	*	*	*	*
Deterioration in morale	5	9	7	4	3
More student demands/numbers	5	9	q	q	q
More duplication of work	2	5	-	4	1
Decreasing space/overcrowding	1	2	4	-	1
Improvements to technology	1	-	3	7	2
Altered job components	*	-	10	2	4
ECA affecting situation	*	4	10	6	10
More staff demands/numbers	*	*	7	*	*
More services being offered	*	2	*	*	*
Other	22	23	9	24	9

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

q denotes categories that were mentioned by more than 10% of an occupational group.

Table 57

Impacts of Workload Changes
Comments Made by 10% or Less of Those Responding to the Question

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 441	N = 62	N = 74	N = 133	N = 157
Comment	%	%	%	%	%
Less job satisfaction	q	q	7	9	9
More administration/meetings	10	3	q	6	8
More time spent teaching	7	*	*	*	*
More job satisfaction	6	3	4	4	q
More deadlines/interruptions/requests	4	3	q	10	q
Change in job priorities	*	2	q	q	q
Dealing with new technology	*	2	7	q	8
Lack of support staff	*	*	9	8	5
Resources/equipment stretched	*	*	*	*	8
Other	13	3	11	7	5

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

q denotes categories that were mentioned by more than 10% of an occupational group.

Table 58

Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by Less than 25% of Respondents

Work-related factors	Academic %	Academic support %	Admin. support %	Library %	Technical %
University management	s	24	s	18	s
Staffing levels in area	s	s	s	s	23
Support staff time available	s	s	s	s	22
Lack of feedback about work	22	22	s	s	s
Department/section organisation	21	18	16	10	20
Lack of promotion/career prospects	21	s	s	s	s
Level of teaching funding for area	17	*	*	*	*
Personal motivation	16	9	8	10	7
Equipment	16	14	21	s	16
Office/working space	14	22	s	24	20
Clarity of job position	12	23	s	15	18
Method of teaching funding for area	12	*	*	*	*
Lack of job security	11	8	14	4	11
Relations with colleagues	10	6	5	6	7
Lack of job autonomy/freedom	9	10	14	11	9
Performance appraisals	8	6	14	5	5
Relations with supervisors	8	14	17	11	15
Relations with outside clients	3	3	1	3	3
Relations with students	2	3	10	6	1
Relations with those supervised	2	9	15	3	4
Level of funding for area	*	22	s	s	21
Method of funding for area	*	22	20	15	20
Work-content factors					
Administration/meetings	s	19	10	15	17
Research/writing/publishing	s	*	*	*	9
Consultation/professional services	16	*	*	*	8
Providing services for students	16	19	22	s	*
Postgraduate supervision	15	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	13	*	*	*	*
Professional development	11	13	9	12	10
Providing services for staff	*	19	12	15	*
Providing services for outside clients	*	8	5	18	*
Technical assistance for teaching	*	*	*	*	18
Instruction/induction of staff/students	*	14	6	17	*
Word processing	*	*	16	*	*
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	15
Technical assistance for research	*	*	*	*	14
General technical services	*	*	*	*	13
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	13	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	13	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

s denotes factors that were rated as "Always" or "Often" stressful by at least 25% of this occupational group.

Table 59

Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Training area	%	%	%	%	%
Everyday requirements of job	56	51	67	76	66
New technology/computers/equipment	37	38	47	46	29
New job responsibilities	33	28	45	47	37
New admin./procedure requirements	21	28	34	36	28
University restructuring and devolution	14	17	14	15	11

Table 60

Percentage of Respondents Not Receiving Adequate Training

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Training area	%	%	%	%	%
New technology/computers/equipment	43	40	39	43	53
University restructuring and devolution	43	40	34	20	40
New admin./procedure requirements	43	40	28	20	33
Everyday requirements of job	23	30	19	16	23
New job responsibilities	30	45	29	27	33

Table 61

Training: Other Categories (Unsure/Not Applicable)

	Academic	Academic support	Admin. support	Library	Technical
	N = 552	N = 82	N = 110	N = 184	N = 253
Training area	%	%	%	%	%
University restructuring and devolution	34	35	44	57	41
New job responsibilities	28	19	20	21	23
New admin./procedure requirements	27	25	32	38	24
Everyday requirements of job	16	12	8	8	10
New technology/computers/equipment	13	16	11	9	16

APPENDIX B

Academic and Administrative Support Questionnaires

WORKLOAD AND STRESS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIVERSITY ACADEMICS

This questionnaire is part of a survey commissioned from the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) by the Association of University Staff (AUS). It is designed to gather information about the workloads and stress factors of AUS members to establish a national picture of the situation in 1994, and to provide a baseline for further monitoring.

NZCER is an independent organisation whose purpose is to promote quality education for New Zealanders through research and resources, advice and information.

Only the NZCER research team will see your completed questionnaire. Your name and responses will be held in complete confidence. Individuals and individual departments or sections will not be identifiable in the report of the survey.

Instructions

Please answer this questionnaire

by ticking all boxes that apply

AND/OR *by writing in the space provided.*

In this questionnaire there are a number of questions that refer to RECENT YEARS. The time frame referred to is from 1989 onwards.

The questionnaire should take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

SECTION A - OCCUPATIONAL DETAILS

Type [ ]
Code [ ]

1. **Please write your job title:**

____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2. **Please indicate which university department you are employed in:**

____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. **Please indicate which faculty/school/division you are employed in:**

____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

4. **Which university are you located at (or attached to)?**

☐ a) Auckland ☐ b) Waikato ☐ c) Massey ☐ d) Victoria
☐ e) Canterbury ☐ f) Lincoln ☐ g) Otago

5. **Please indicate the total length of time you have spent in university employment:**

☐ a) 0-5 yrs ☐ b) 6-10 yrs ☐ c) 11-20 yrs ☐ d) 21-30 yrs ☐ e) 31+ yrs

6. **How long have you been in your present position?**

☐ a) Less than 1 yr ☐ b) 1-2 yrs ☐ c) 3-4 yrs ☐ d) 5-6 yrs
☐ e) 7-8 yrs ☐ f) 9+ yrs

7. **How many academics (including yourself) are there in your university department (both full- and part-time)?**

☐ a) 1 ☐ b) 2-5 ☐ c) 6-10 ☐ d) 11-20 ☐ e) 21-30
☐ f) 31-40 ☐ g) 41+

8. **Are you employed by your university:**

(For medical academics if you work on a proportional basis for your university please indicate part-time):

☐ a) Full-time **or** ☐ b) Part-time

9. **Are you employed on a permanent or limited-term contract?**

☐ a) Permanent ☐ b) Limited-term ☐ c) Other **(please describe)**

____
____
____

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

10. If you are employed on a limited-term contract, how long is the term of your contract?

☐ a) 0-5 mths ☐ b) 6-11 mths ☐ c) 1-2 yrs ☐ d) 3-4 yrs
☐ e) Not applicable ☐ f) Other (please describe)

g 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

11. What is the average number of hours you spend on university-related work per week?

☐ a) 0-9 hrs ☐ b) 10-19 hrs ☐ c) 20-29 hrs ☐ d) 30-34 hrs
☐ e) 35-39 hrs ☐ f) 40-44 hrs ☐ g) 45-49 hrs ☐ h) 50-54 hrs
☐ i) 55-59 hrs ☐ j) 60-64 hrs ☐ k) 65-69 hrs ☐ l) 70+ hrs

12. Do you ever work in the evenings or take work home (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - on 3 or more evenings a week ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a week
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a month ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a term
☐ e) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a year ☐ f) Never

13. Do you work in the weekends (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - most weekends ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a month
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a term ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a year
☐ e) Never

SECTION B - STUDENT/STAFF INTERACTIONS AND INSTRUCTION

1. What is the minimum number of undergraduates you teach in any 1 internal or external course (if more than 1 stream per course indicate the total number of students in the course):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40 ☐ f) 41-50
☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71-80 ☐ j) 81-90 ☐ k) 91+

2. What is the maximum number of undergraduates you teach in any 1 internal or external course (if more than 1 stream per course indicate the total number of students in the course):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-20 ☐ c) 21-40 ☐ d) 41-60 ☐ e) 61-80 ☐ f) 81-100
☐ g) 101-200 ☐ h) 201-300 ☐ i) 301-400 ☐ j) 401-500 ☐ k) 501+

3. Has the number of students you teach overall changed in recent years (from 1989 onwards)?

☐ a) Increased - large amount ☐ b) Increased - small amount ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Decreased - small amount ☐ e) Decreased - large amount ☐ f) Varies from year to year
☐ g) Not sure ☐ h) Not applicable

4. If the number of students you teach has increased, has this had an impact on your workload?

☐ a) No impact ☐ b) Increased my workload ☐ c) Decreased my workload
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

Please comment:

____ £ 1 2 3

____ 4 5 6

____ 7 8 9

5. How many courses/papers do you have overall responsibility for this year?

___________ Courses per year

6. How many undergraduate courses/papers do you lecture/give tutorials/labs for this year?

___________ Courses per year

7. How many postgraduate tutorials, seminars or classes in total will you give this year?

___________ Tutorials/seminars per year

8. How many postgraduate students (honours, MA, PhD, diploma etc.,) do you currently supervise projects or theses for?

___________ Students

9. In term-time how many hours do you spend on direct contact teaching per week on average this year?

___________ Undergraduate hours per week ___________ Postgraduate hours per week

10. Do you contribute to any induction or staff training courses during the year?

___________ Courses per year

SECTION C - WORKLOAD

1. Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Teaching (planning/evaluating/in-class time/supervising/student queries)

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Research/writing/publishing

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Other areas (e.g., clinical work)

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to q.6, next page.

2. Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has changed in recent years (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Contact teaching (undergraduate)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

b) Contact teaching (postgraduate)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

c) Postgraduate supervision

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

d) Student queries/counselling

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

e) Course and lecture planning/study guide development/evaluation and marking

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

f) Research/writing/publishing

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) Consultancies/professional services

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

j) Other areas (e.g., clinical work)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

(Please describe)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. Do you think your workload has changed in total in recent years?

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

If your workload has not changed please go to q.6, below.

4. What are the reasons for the changes to your workload?

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

5. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) of changes to your workload on you, and your work?

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

6. Do you expect the level of your workload to change in the next 3 years?

☐ a) Increase ☐ b) Decrease ☐ c) Stay about the same ☐ d) Not sure

7. How do you view the balance of time you spend on teaching, research and administration?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more teaching time
☐ b) Prefer less teaching time
☐ c) Prefer more research time
☐ d) Prefer less research time
☐ e) Prefer more administration time
☐ f) Prefer less administration time
☐ g) Content with the balance
☐ h) Not sure
☐ i) Other
☐ j) Not applicable

SECTION D - CHANGES TO YOUR WORK SITUATION

1. Have you noticed any changes in the last 4 years to the following areas of your work? (If you have not worked in your job for longer than 4 years, have you noticed any changes to the following since you started your job?)

(You may feel that more than one category per question best describes your situation - please tick all boxes that apply.)

a) The quality of your teaching

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of your research work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of the resources/equipment you work with

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your work environment (space, lighting etc.)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your interactions with colleagues

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your interactions with other university staff

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

g) The quality of your interactions with students

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

h) The quality of your interactions with clients outside the university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

i) The quality of the administration, organisation, and planning in your department

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

j) The quality of management within your university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

k) The level of funding for your teaching work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

l) The level of funding for your research work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

m) The method of funding for your teaching work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

n) The method of funding for your research work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

o) Your career prospects/promotion opportunities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

p) Your ability to exercise academic freedom

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

q) Your ability to take advantage of research leave

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

r) The quality of student evaluations of your teaching

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

s) The quality of performance reviews and appraisals of your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

t) The quality of your working life in general

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

(Comment:)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2. What do you think the changes (if any) to your work situation are due to?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) A change in job position
☐ b) Working with different colleagues
☐ c) Increases in student numbers
☐ d) Decreases in student numbers
☐ e) Increases in workload
☐ f) Decreases in workload
☐ g) New or increased job responsibilities
☐ h) Decreases in job responsibilities
☐ i) Changes to area/department funding
☐ j) Organisational changes in area/department
☐ k) Requirements of new legislation
☐ l) Changes in overall university management
☐ m) Changes to reporting/output requirements
☐ n) Changes due to Employment Contracts Act
☐ o) New/changed buildings/work spaces
☐ p) New/changed equipment
☐ q) Not sure what caused changes
☐ r) No changes noticed
☐ s) Other **(please describe)**

____
____
____

t 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) of the changes to university structure and management in recent years on your work?

____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

If your work situation has not changed in any way please go to q.5, next page.

4. If your work situation has changed in any way has this had any effect on:

a) The quality of your physical health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of your emotional health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your family life/relationships

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your leisure activities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

5. Do you feel you have been given enough training to adequately cope with:

	Yes (a)	No (b)	Not sure (c)	Not applicable (d)
a) The everyday requirements of your job	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) New job responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) New technology/computers/equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) New administration and procedure requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) University restructuring and devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐

(Comment:)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

SECTION E - STRESS AND WORK PRESSURES

1. Do you find your job stressful?

☐ a) Almost never ☐ b) Sometimes ☐ c) Often ☐ d) Almost always

2. If you find your job stressful, what are the 3 things that cause the most stress for you?

1st -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. Do you feel your job has become more or less stressful in recent years?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful ☐ f) New to job

4. Do you expect your job to become more or less stressful in future?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful

(Comment:)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

5. Are you generally satisfied with your job?

☐ a) Yes - very satisfied ☐ b) Yes - satisfied ☐ c) Neutral
☐ d) No - dissatisfied ☐ e) No - very dissatisfied ☐ f) Not sure

6. Do you feel that your job has become more or less satisfying in recent years?

☐ a) Much more satisfying ☐ b) More satisfying ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less satisfying ☐ e) Much less satisfying ☐ f) New to job
☐ g) Not sure

7. If your level of job satisfaction has changed please indicate the reasons:

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

8. Have you ever suffered from a work-related injury or stress illness while working in a New Zealand university?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

Please describe:

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

9. Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

(Comment:)

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

10. Please rate how often you find the following workload, and work-related, factors a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
a)	Contact teaching (undergraduate)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b)	Contact teaching (postgraduate)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c)	Postgraduate supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d)	Student queries/counselling	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e)	Course/study guide planning/evaluation/marking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f)	Research/writing/publishing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g)	Consulting/professional services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h)	Professional development/reading/training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i)	Internal administration/meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j)	Student numbers/class sizes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k)	Overall level of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l)	Irregularity of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m)	Interruptions to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n)	Lack of recognition for work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o)	Lack of feedback about work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p)	Deadlines/demands	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q)	Personal motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r)	Clarity of job position/description/roles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s)	Lack of job security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t)	Lack of job autonomy/academic freedom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u)	Lack of promotion/career prospects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v)	Performance/student appraisals of your work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
w)	Level of teaching funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x)	Level of research funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
y)	Method of teaching funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z)	Method of research funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
aa)	Staffing levels in your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ba)	Support staff time available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ca)	Availability of relieving staff for your job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
da)	Office/work/teaching space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ea)	Equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
fa)	Relations with students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ga)	Relations with those supervised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ha)	Relations with supervisors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ia)	Relations with colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ja)	Relations with outside clients	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ka)	Department/section organisation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
la)	University management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ma)	University climate/morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. If you could change 3 things about your job to make it more worthwhile for you - what would these be?

1st change -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd change -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd change -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

12. What are the 3 major issues (if any) at your university that currently concern you?

1st issue -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd issue -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd issue -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

SECTION F - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your age:

☐ a) Less than 20 ☐ b) 21-30 ☐ c) 31-40 ☐ d) 41-50 ☐ e) 51-60 ☐ f) 61+

2. Your gender:

☐ a) Female ☐ b) Male

3. Please indicate the ethnic group(s) you belong to:

☐ a) Pakeha/European ☐ b) Maori ☐ c) Pacific Island ☐ d) Asian
☐ e) Other (please describe)

r 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

4. Please indicate how much you are paid:

☐ a) Less than $10,000 ☐ b) $ 10,001 - 20,000 ☐ c) $ 20,001 - 30,000 ☐ d) $ 30,001 - 40,000
☐ e) $ 40,001 - 50,000 ☐ f) $ 50,001 - 60,000 ☐ g) $ 60,001 - 70,000 ☐ h) $ 70,001 - 80,000
☐ i) $ 80,001 - 90,000 ☐ j) $ 90,001 +

5. Do you think you will be in university employment in 5 years' time?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

6. If you answered NO to the above question, what are the reasons why you would change your job?

______________________________ 1 2 3
______________________________ 4 5 6
______________________________ 7 8 9

7. Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

______________________________ a 1 2 3
______________________________ 4 5 6
______________________________ 7 8 9
______________________________ b 1 2 3
______________________________ 4 5 6
______________________________ 7 8 9
______________________________ c 1 2 3
______________________________ 4 5 6
______________________________ 7 8 9

8. Are you willing to be contacted for further in-depth interviews?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No

Thank you very much for your time in
completing this questionnaire.

Please return it to NZCER, PO Box 3237, Wellington,
in the Freepost envelope provided by Monday 1 August.

WORKLOAD AND STRESS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT STAFF

This questionnaire is part of a survey commissioned from the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) by the Association of University Staff (AUS). It is designed to gather information about the workloads and stress factors of AUS members to establish a national picture of the situation in 1994, and to provide a baseline for further monitoring.

NZCER is an independent organisation whose purpose is to promote quality education for New Zealanders through research and resources, advice and information.

Only the NZCER research team will see your completed questionnaire. Your name and responses will be held in complete confidence. Individuals and individual departments or sections will not be identifiable in the report of the survey.

Instructions

Please answer this questionnaire

by ticking all boxes that apply

AND/OR *by writing in the space provided.*

In this questionnaire there are a number of questions that refer to RECENT YEARS. The time frame referred to is from 1989 onwards.

The questionnaire should take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

100

SECTION A - OCCUPATIONAL DETAILS

Type [ ]
Code [ ]

1. **Please write your job title:**

____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2. **Please indicate which university section/area/department you are employed in:**

____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. **Which university are you located at (or attached to)?**

☐ a) Auckland ☐ b) Waikato ☐ c) Massey ☐ d) Victoria
☐ e) Canterbury ☐ f) Lincoln ☐ g) Otago

4. **Please indicate the total length of time you have spent in university employment:**

☐ a) 0-5 yrs ☐ b) 6-10 yrs ☐ c) 11-20 yrs ☐ d) 21-30 yrs ☐ e) 31+ yrs

5. **How long have you been in your present position?**

☐ a) Less than 1 yr ☐ b) 1-2 yrs ☐ c) 3-4 yrs ☐ d) 5-6 yrs
☐ e) 7-8 yrs ☐ f) 9+ yrs

6. **How many administrative support staff (including yourself) are there in your area or department (both full- and part-time)?**

☐ a) 1 ☐ b) 2-5 ☐ c) 6-10 ☐ d) 11-20
☐ e) 21-30 ☐ f) 31-40 ☐ g) 41+

7. **Are you employed by your university:**

☐ a) Full-time **or** ☐ b) Part-time

8. **Are you employed on a permanent or limited-term contract?**

☐ a) Permanent ☐ b) Limited-term ☐ c) Other **(please describe)**

____
____
____

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

9. **If you are employed on a limited-term contract, how long is the term of your contract?**

☐ a) 0-5 mths ☐ b) 6-11 mths ☐ c) 1-2 yrs ☐ d) 3-4 yrs
☐ e) Not applicable ☐ f) Other (please describe)

____
____
____

g 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

10. For how many hours a week are you employed?

______________ Hours per week

11. What is the average number of actual hours you spend on university-related work per week?

☐ a) 0-9 hrs ☐ b) 10-19 hrs ☐ c) 20-29 hrs ☐ d) 30-34 hrs
☐ e) 35-39 hrs ☐ f) 40-44 hrs ☐ g) 45-49 hrs ☐ h) 50-54 hrs
☐ i) 55-59 hrs ☐ j) 60-64 hrs ☐ k) 65-69 hrs ☐ l) 70+ hrs

12. Do you ever work in the evenings or take work home (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - on 3 or more evenings a week ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a week
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a month ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a term
☐ e) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a year ☐ f) Never

13. Do you work in the weekends (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - most weekends ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a month
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a term ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a year
☐ e) Never

SECTION B - STUDENT/STAFF INTERACTIONS AND INSTRUCTION

1. Approximately how many student requests do you deal with per day on average?

☐ a) None ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40
☐ f) 41-50 ☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71+

2. Approximately how many staff requests do you deal with per day on average?

☐ a) None ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40
☐ f) 41-50 ☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71+

3. Do you receive requests for consultation, information, or professional services from clients (individuals or organisations) outside the university?

☐ a) No ☐ b) 1 or 2 a term ☐ c) 1 or 2 a month
☐ d) 1 or 2 a week ☐ e) 1 or 2 a day ☐ f) More than 1 or 2 a day

4. Please indicate if the number of requests you deal with from the following groups has changed in recent years (from 1989 onwards):

	Large increase (a)	Small increase (b)	No change (c)	Small decrease (d)	Large decrease (e)	Varies (f)	Not sure (g)	Not applicable (h)
a) Student requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Staff requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Outside client requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. If the number of requests from students, staff and outside clients has increased, has this had an impact on your workload?

☐ a) No impact ☐ b) Increased my workload ☐ c) Decreased my workload
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

Please comment:

____ f 1 2 3
____ 4 5 6
____ 7 8 9

6. Do you contribute to any induction or staff training courses in the year?

____________ Courses per year

SECTION C - WORKLOAD

1. Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Providing support or information for staff/students/outside clients (organising timetables/lecture rooms/travel/answering student queries/providing information for outside agencies etc.)

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Word-processing/copying/collating

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Other areas

☐ a) 1-10% ☐ b) 11-20% ☐ c) 21-30% ☐ d) 31-40% ☐ e) 41-50%
☐ f) 51-60% ☐ g) 61-70% ☐ h) 71-80% ☐ i) 81% + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to q.6, page 5.

2. Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has changed in recent years (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Providing support or information for staff (organising timetables/lecture rooms/travel etc.)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

b) Providing support or information for students (answering queries etc.)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

c) Providing support or information for clients outside the university (answering queries etc.)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

d) Word-processing/copying/collating

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

e) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

f) Financial management/budgeting

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) Running/assisting with induction courses/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Other areas

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

(Please describe)

f 1 2 3
____
4 5 6
____
7 8 9
____

3. Do you think your workload has changed in total in recent years?

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

If your workload has not changed please go to q.6, next page.

4. What are the reasons for the changes to your workload?

____

____

____ 1 2 3

____ 4 5 6

____ 7 8 9

____

5. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) of changes to your workload on you, and your work?

____

____

____ 1 2 3

____ 4 5 6

____ 7 8 9

____

6. Do you expect the level of your workload to change in the next 3 years?

☐ a) Increase ☐ b) Decrease ☐ c) Stay about the same ☐ d) Not sure

7. How do you view the balance of time you spend on providing support or information and your other administrative duties?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more support/information time ☐ b) Prefer less support/information time
☐ c) Prefer more administration time ☐ d) Prefer less administration time
☐ e) Content with the balance ☐ f) Not sure
☐ g) Other ☐ h) Not applicable

SECTION D - CHANGES TO YOUR WORK SITUATION

1. Have you noticed any changes in the last 4 years to the following areas of your work? (If you have not worked in your job for longer than 4 years, have you noticed any changes to the following since you started your job?)

(You may feel that more than one category per question best describes your situation - please tick all boxes that apply.)

a) The quality of the service(s) you provide

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of the resources/equipment you work with

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your work environment (space, lighting etc.)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your interactions with colleagues

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your interactions with other university staff

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your interactions with students

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

g) The quality of your interactions with clients outside the university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

h) The quality of the administration, organisation, and planning in your work area

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

i) The quality of management within your university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

j) The level of funding for your area of work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

k) The method of funding for your area of work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

l) Your career prospects/promotion opportunities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

m) The quality of performance reviews and appraisals of your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

n) The quality of your working life in general

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

(Comment:)

____

____

____

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2. What do you think the changes (if any) to your work situation are due to?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) A change in job position
☐ b) Working with different colleagues
☐ c) Increases in student numbers
☐ d) Decreases in student numbers
☐ e) Increases in workload
☐ f) Decreases in workload
☐ g) New or increased job responsibilities
☐ h) Decreases in job responsibilities
☐ i) Changes to area/department funding
☐ j) Organisational changes in area/department
☐ k) Requirements of new legislation
☐ l) Changes in overall university management
☐ m) Changes to reporting/output requirements
☐ n) Changes due to Employment Contracts Act
☐ o) New/changed buildings/work spaces
☐ p) New/changed equipment
☐ q) Not sure what caused changes
☐ r) No changes noticed
☐ s) Other **(please describe)**

t 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) of the changes to university structure and management in recent years on your work?

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

If your work situation has not changed go to q.5, next page.

4. If your work situation has changed in any way has this had any effect on:

a) The quality of your physical health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of your emotional health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your family life/relationships

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your leisure activities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

5. Do you feel you have been given enough training to adequately cope with:

	Yes	No	Not sure	Not applicable
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
a) The everyday requirements of your job	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) New job responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) New technology/computers/equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) New administration and procedure requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) University restructuring and devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐

(Comment:)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

SECTION E - STRESS AND WORK PRESSURES

1. Do you find your job stressful?

☐ a) Almost never ☐ b) Sometimes ☐ c) Often ☐ d) Almost always

2. If you find your job stressful, what are the 3 things that cause the most stress for you?

1st -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. Do you feel your job has become more or less stressful in recent years?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful ☐ f) New to job

4. Do you expect your job to become more or less stressful in future?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful

(Comment:)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

5. Are you generally satisfied with your job?

☐ a) Yes - very satisfied ☐ b) Yes - satisfied ☐ c) Neutral
☐ d) No - dissatisfied ☐ e) No - very dissatisfied ☐ f) Not sure

6. Do you feel that your job has become more or less satisfying in recent years?

☐ a) Much more satisfying ☐ b) More satisfying ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less satisfying ☐ e) Much less satisfying ☐ f) New to job
☐ g) Not sure

7. If your level of job satisfaction has changed please indicate the reasons:

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

8. Have you ever suffered from a work-related injury or stress illness while working in a New Zealand university?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

Please describe:

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

9. Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

(Comment:)

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

10. Please rate how often you find the following workload, and work-related, factors a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
a)	Providing support/information for staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b)	Providing support/information for students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c)	Providing support/information for outside clients	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d)	Word-processing/copying/collating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e)	Internal administration/meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f)	Financial management/budgeting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g)	Professional development/reading/training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h)	Assisting with induction/training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i)	Student numbers/class sizes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j)	Overall level of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k)	Irregularity of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l)	Interruptions to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m)	Lack of recognition for work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n)	Lack of feedback about work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o)	Deadlines/demands	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p)	Personal motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q)	Clarity of job position/description/roles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r)	Lack of job security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s)	Lack of job autonomy/freedom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t)	Lack of promotion/career prospects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u)	Performance/student appraisals of your work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v)	Level of funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
w)	Method of funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x)	Staffing levels in your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
y)	Support staff time available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z)	Availability of relieving staff for your job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
aa)	Office/work/teaching space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ba)	Equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ca)	Relations with students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
da)	Relations with those supervised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ea)	Relations with supervisors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
fa)	Relations with colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ga)	Relations with outside clients	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ha)	Department/section organisation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ia)	University management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ja)	University climate/morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. If you could change 3 things about your job to make it more worthwhile for you - what would these be?

1st change -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd change -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd change -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

12. What are the 3 major issues (if any) at your university that currently concern you?

1st issue -

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

2nd issue -

b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3rd issue -

c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

SECTION F - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your age:

☐ a) Less than 20 ☐ b) 21-30 ☐ c) 31-40 ☐ d) 41-50 ☐ e) 51-60 ☐ f) 61+

2. Your gender:

☐ a) Female ☐ b) Male

3. Please indicate the ethnic group(s) you belong to:

☐ a) Pakeha/European ☐ b) Maori ☐ c) Pacific Island ☐ d) Asian
☐ e) Other (please describe)

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

4. Please indicate how much you are paid:

☐ a) Less than $10,000 ☐ b) $ 10,001 - 20,000 ☐ c) $ 20,001 - 30,000 ☐ d) $ 30,001 - 40,000
☐ e) $ 40,001 - 50,000 ☐ f) $ 50,001 - 60,000 ☐ g) $ 60,001 - 70,000 ☐ h) $ 70,001 - 80,000
☐ i) $ 80,001 - 90,000 ☐ j) $ 90,001 +

5. Do you think you will be in university employment in 5 years' time?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

6. If you answered NO to the above question, what are the reasons why you would change your job?

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

7. Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

8. Are you willing to be contacted for further in-depth interviews?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No

Thank you very much for your time in
completing this questionnaire.

Please return it to NZCER, PO Box 3237, Wellington,
in the Freepost envelope provided by Monday 1 August.

References

Allen, H. L. (1994). Workload and productivity in an accountability era. *The NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, pp. 25-38. Washington: National Education Association Publishing.

Association of University Teachers. (1990). *Goodwill under stress: Morale in U.K. universities.* England: The Association of University Teachers.

Answering the stress signals (1994, 14 January) *Times Educational Supplement*, p.12.

Bleything, W. B. (1982). On the workload of faculty. Part III: Faculty load formulas. *Journal of Optometric Education*, *8*(1), 18-22.

Blix, A. G. et al (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research*, *36*(2), 157-69.

Borg, M. G. (1990). Occupational stress in British educational settings: A review. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, *10*(2), 103-26.

Caputo, J. S. (1991). *Stress and burnout in library service.* Phoenix: The Oryx Press.

Court, S. (1994). *Long hours, little thanks. A survey of the use of time by full-time academic and related staff in the traditional UK universities.* London: Association of University Teachers.

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1993). *National Report on Australia's Higher Education Sector.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Department of Statistics. (1992). *1991 New Zealand census of population and dwellings: National summary.* Wellington: Department of Statistics.

Fairweather, J. S. (1994). The value of teaching, research, and service. *The NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, pp. 39-58. Washington: National Education Association Publishing.

Fisher, S. (1994). *Stress in academic life: The mental assembly line.* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Gmelch, W. H. et al (1984a). *Factorial dimensions of faculty stress.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 68th, New Orleans, LA.

Gmelch, W. H. et al (1984b). Stress in academe: a national perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, *20*, 477-90.

Gmelch, W. H. et al. Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national study. *Research in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 266-86.

Gourley, T. (1993). *Stress study.* Lincoln University, New Zealand.

Graham, A. (1989). *The experiences of academic staff newly appointed to university.* MA thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Johnstone, M. (1993). *Teachers' workload and associated stress*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Jordon, S. M. and Layzell, D. T. (1992). *A case study of faculty workload issues in Arizona: Implications for state higher educational policy*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

Livingstone, I. D. (1994). *The workload of primary school teachers. A Wellington region survey*. Wellington: Chartwell Consultants and NZEI: Te Riu Roa.

Manthei, R. and Gilmore, A. (1994). Is stress among New Zealand teachers increasing? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(1), 73-87.

Ministry of Education. (1991). *New Zealand University Summary Statistics*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *Education Statistics of New Zealand 1994*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Mingle, J. R. (1992). *Faculty work and the cost/quality/access collision*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

Montgomery, D. C. and Lewis, G. L. (1994). Administrative staff: Salaries and issues. *The NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, pp. 123-149. Washington: National Education Association Publishing.

The parts assessors can't reach. (1994, 4 February). *Times Higher Supplement*, p. 3.

Peters, M. C. (1991). *The New Zealand academic profession in transition*. MA thesis, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.

Russell, A. B. (1992). *Faculty workload: State and system perspectives. State policy and college learning*. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

Sharpley, C. F. (1994). *Report of a survey of stress and health at Monash University*. Melbourne: Centre for Stress Management and Research, Faculty of Education, Monash University.

Strachan, J. and Duirs, L. (1993). *The position of general staff women in New Zealand universities*. Waikato University: Educational Leadership Centre.

Vasil, L. (1993). Gender differences in the academic career in New Zealand universities. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 28*(2), 143-53.

Worth, H. (1992). *Report on issues affecting academic staff at Massey University*. Auckland: Auckland Uniservices Limited.

Wylie, C. (1994). *Self-managing schools in New Zealand: The fifth year*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.